politics

25¢ a copy December, 1945

Starvation!

America's Christmas Gift to the European Peoples

(An 11-page survey by Dwight Macdonald)

"Europe is threatened by a catastrophe this winter which has no precedent since the Black Death of 1348." ***(London "Observer", Oct. 28, 1945.)***

"No child born in Germany this year will survive the coming winter. Only half the children aged less than three years will survive." ***(Hans Albrecht, leading German Quaker, in a report to the British Friends' Ambulance Unit in Berlin, Sept. 15, 1945.)***

The two statements quoted above may seem exaggerated. In the following pages I have brought together some data to show they are not. I have also told some of the shabby story of the American Government's failure to send overseas any significant part of our record food production. The argument may be broadly outlined as follows:

1. Europe's food production this year is 25% under the peacetime level, 15% even under last year's low level. This means that in some countries (Germany, Poland, Greece, Yugoslavia) there is mass starvation, while even in countries like France and Holland the average diet is lower than the 2,000 calories a day considered a rockbottom minimum for health.

2. American food production reached new record heights this year, and the Secretary of Agriculture has suggested that crop quotas may have to be reduced next year to protect farm prices. U. S. civilians will consume meat this winter at an average rate of 150 pounds per person per year, as against the 1935-1939 average of 126 pounds. The next highest known meat diet in Europe is that in England (94 pounds); after this comes Holland (28 pounds). Our Government has withheld even the vast Army surplus stocks— $3 billions of civilian goods in Europe alone— from the Europeans up to this date.

3. In the past year the American Congress and the American President have taken one step after another to restrict the flow of overseas relief to a trickle. The abrupt cancellation of Lend-Lease by Truman on August 21 reduced the flow to Britain and the Western European countries; only now, three months later, are new financial arrangements being concluded. Congress was asked early in September to appropriate the final instalment of the UNRRA contribution it had promised last winter. As this goes to press, the bill is not yet through Congress. Since UNRRA was dependent on this contribution for the funds to finance about three-quarters of its shipments for the final quarter of 1945, this delay of over three months by Congress means quite literally that tens of thousands of Europeans who would otherwise have survived the winter will die of cold and hunger.

4. Vengeance is being wreaked on the German people on a Nazi scale. The four occupying powers are destroying Germany's industrial capacity, paralyzing her transport, and doing little to relieve the famine conditions that are appearing as a consequence. Between 6 and 10 million people have been forced out of their homes in Eastern Germany by the Russians, Poles and Czechs, and left to wander aimlessly over the roads, foodless, shelterless, with no provision made by the occupying powers to care for them. The U. S. State Department, furthermore, has up to now refused to open the mails to Germany, and has rejected the urgent requests of the church and other private relief agencies that they be permitted to go into Germany and alleviate some of the horror and starvation.

5. The reaction of the American people and of their leaders to the atrocious conduct of their Government toward the suffering people of Europe has been apathetic. While Gallup Polls show that most of them are willing to sacrifice some food to help at least the liberated nations, there has not been enough public pressure to cause even one prominent Senator to make an issue out of the delay on UNRRA. There is even less concern about the German horror. British liberals like Gollancz and Bertrand Russell have organized a "Save Europe Now" movement on a national scale— with the emphasis on the area of greatest need: Germany— but no such committee or movement exists over here. The general indifference probably reflects provincialism rather than callousness.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Contents

America's Christmas Gift to Europe: Starvation, by Dwight Macdonald 353
Letter to a Judge, by Arthur Wiser..... 364
The Decline of the French Communists, by Gelo and Andrea 366
War Trials and German Re-Education, by Bruno Bettelheim 368
NEW ROADS IN POLITICS (1)
Personalism against Totalitarianism, by Will Herberg..... 369
Towards a Socialist Program, by European..... 374
Revolution, Sociolatry and War, by Paul Goodman.. 376
PERIODICALS 380
THE INTELLIGENCE OFFICE 381
CONTRIBUTORS 382
Report on Food Packages..... 383

The Strange Case of the $3 Billions Surplus Goods

Here and there on the European continent today are dotted vast warehouses and enormous supply-dumps containing some $3 billions worth of such necessities of life as shoes, trucks, foodstuffs, clothes, textiles, and medical supplies. $3 billions is quite a lot of goods—almost as much, for example, as UNRRA will have spent in its whole existence when it winds up operations at the end of next year. It takes little imagination to realize the life-giving significance of these goods to a continent whose people are ragged, hungry, shoeless and cold. These vast stores are guarded by thousands of American soldiers, who want only one thing: to go home. But the soldiers don't go home, and the people of Europe don't get the goods, and rust and decay do their slow work as the winter draws in—for the $3 billions worth of goods are U. S. Army surplus stocks. (There is another $3 billions worth of surplus combat material, which need not concern us here.)

There are three ways in which the U. S. Government could dispose of this surplus. It could give it outright, or lend it on generous terms, to its former Allies as some recompense for their help in the war, and for the devastation the American air force and artillery wrought on their cities and industries. (I mention this alternative only for the sake of logical completeness; it is, of course, completely unreal.) It could use it as an instrument of power-politics, the way Hoover used food in the last war. But we aren't doing that this time; we're just pulling out, turning our back on the whole business. It looked as though some political use might be made of the surpluses when, on September 24, Truman transferred to the State Department the job of disposing of them. And indeed his Reconversion Director, John W. Snyder, did tell a Senate Committee at that time that "some of the vast surpluses might be traded for foreign commercial and military concessions. . . . Mr. Snyder mentioned the possibility of using the surplus material as an instrument of post-war foreign policy after outlining some of the difficulties involved in obtaining even a moderate monetary return for supplies which originally cost billions of dollars."

However, neither of these policies was adopted, since each would have taken a certain amount of imagination. A third alternative, the one suitable to the routinized provincialism that marks the Truman Administration, was apparently chosen: to dispose of the surplus for hard dollars, and for nothing else. A recent news story which was buried in the back pages but should have been front-page material, tells the results of this certified accountant's approach:

PARIS, Oct. 13—Because the European governments have shown anything but alacrity in buying up the enormous quantities of U. S. Army surpluses that are rapidly accumulating, John C. Virden, head of the Army & Navy Liquidation Commission in Europe, said today that major changes in disposal policy may be necessary, including the abandonment of previous insistence on payment in dollars. . . . "The tragedy of the situation," Mr. Virden explained, "is that most of the surplus, which will ultimately total $6 or $7 billions worth (only half of it combat material) is sorely needed in Europe right now—transport, raw materials, clothing, medical supplies, batteries, etc. Originally it had been hoped to sell most of it before winter."

Only two big sales had been made up to then, Virden revealed: $150 millions worth to UNRRA, and $5,500,000 worth of textiles to Belgium. That left just $2,844,500,000 to go—and, so far as I can find out, no further large sales have been made up to the moment of writing (Dec. 3). "Each month," added Virden, "material deteriorates. In six or eight months, American and British exporters may be ready to deliver, and the surplus will become increasingly unsalable." Here, incidentally may be another reason—beside bureaucratic routine—for letting the supplies rot rather than giving them out: the export market will be that much fatter if these goods are allowed to become "increasingly unsalable." On the other hand, one might think exporters would want as many of their customers as possible to be above ground.

The reasons for the European governments not buying up the surplus goods are probably threefold:

politics

VOLUME 2, NO. 12 (Whole No. 23) DECEMBER, 1945

Business Manager: Nancy Macdonald
Circulation Manager: Dorothy Brumm
Editor: Dwight Macdonald

POLITICS is published monthly at 45 Astor Place, New York 3, N. Y., by Politics Publishing Co. Telephone: GRamercy 3-1512.

Subscription $2.50 for one year, $4 for two years. Add 30c a year for Canada. 50c a year for all other foreign countries. Single copy: 25c. Most back issues are still available.

Special rate for service men and C.O.'s anywhere: $1.75 a year.

Subscribers Note: It takes us 10 days to change your address. Please let us have changes of address promptly.

Copyright December, 1945, by Politics Publishing Co.

Entered as second-class matter March 16, 1944, at the post-office at New York, under the Act of March 3, 1879.

35

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

(1) They have very few dollars and hesitate to spend them on goods which they know the Army will ultimately have to sell to them or not at all, since there is no question of the goods being brought back to flood the home market.

(2) They are waiting for the outcome of the negotiations on credit terms that the British, the French and other governments have been carrying on in Washington ever since the cancellation of Lend-Lease last August. These negotiations have been protracted largely because of the "Uncle Sam is not Santa Claus" psychology of our government.

(3) The valuation set on these goods may well be considered excessive by governments with slender resources. The *N. Y. Times* of Dec. 6 notes: "A waiting game is being played by the U. S. military authorities and the governments of Western European countries over the disposal of some 1600 Army locomotives and 50,000 freight cars." The governments want lower prices, the Army won't come down, and so this desperately needed rolling stock stands idle for months. Thus also Virden revealed that the French had offered only half as much for the Rhone Valley pipeline as the Americans are asking. And Snyder on Sept. 24 gave a glimpse of the sharp trading practices which are endearing us to Europeans when he complacently told of offering (successfully) to the Italian Government $1 million worth of Army surplus goods in exchange for the Palazzo Margerita, which is to be added to our embassy in Rome and which "the State Department says is worth $2 millions."

Disposal of our military surplus in the Pacific is proceeding at the same microscopic pace: a letter in *Time* of Dec. 3 quotes the Army News Service: "The United States has made the first large-scale sale of surplus war goods in the Pacific . . . $20 millions worth to the Netherlands East Indies Government." (The State Department forbade inclusion of arms or munitions.) I don't know what the total in the Pacific is, but it must be several billions, which might mean from one to two billions of usable civilian supplies. These are also rotting in the dumps while the people of China, the Philippines and Japan starve.

Finally, Walter Oakes in the November POLITICS estimated that there is about $10 billions of Government-owned surplus goods, raw materials and machinery in this country. "If but half this amount were given to the countries in desperate need of relief," he wrote, "world recovery would be promoted" and suffering relieved. He predicted (correctly) that instead "the rest of the world will suffer the most bitter winter in history, while the American government realizes less than 30 cents on the dollar from the sale of surplus property."

Food—the General Picture

The Department of Agriculture estimates that 1945 world food production will be 10% below the 1935-1939 level. This would not be catastrophic if the deficit were distributed evenly. But it is not. The Western hemisphere, especially the USA, is producing far more than before, while Europe, North Africa and the Far East are producing much less. North Africa, for example, normally exports 450,000 tons of wheat a year to France; this year a combination of war, drought and locusts has forced it to import 1,900,000 tons—and even this did not prevent the famine conditions which caused last spring's native rebellion (see the June POLITICS). In Europe there was a drought in the south and too much rain in the north. This—added to war damage, lack of manpower, transport and fertilizers—reduced 1945 agricultural production 25% under that of pre-war years and 15% even under last year's semi-starvation level.

> ***We promised much to the occupied nations while the Nazis overran their lands. We asked not only that they continue their stubborn resistance but that they increase it. Now the time has come to redeem that promise. I am sure that we, who spent hundreds of billions of dollars to destroy our enemy, will gladly spend the comparatively small amount now asked to help our friends back on the road of self-sufficiency.***
> ***(Director H. H. Lehman of UNRRA, Sept. 5)***
>
> ***U. S. 1945 FOOD CROPS HIGHEST IN YEARS***
> **(Headline, "N. Y. Times", Sept. 18)**
>
> **The average Greek man, woman and child must live, this winter, on 1/3 of the American consumption of calories . . . 10,000 Poles are dying monthly from tuberculosis caused by malnutrition; 75% of the adults and 85% of the children are without footwear . . . 5,000 die monthly in Vienna from tuberculosis, and the death rate is expected to double by Christmas. . . . In the Ukraine, 15 million people are homeless.**
> **("N. Y. Times", Nov. 13)**

The problem in this country, on the other hand, is not too little food but too much food. This is a problem for reasons of both health and economics. Describing the bumper crop of fruits, vegetables, milk, fish, fats, and vegetables which this country produced in 1945, Professor Henry Keller, Jr., of Rutgers warned: "The population of the United States cannot eat this amount of food and remain healthy. If some of it is being moved abroad for the Army, the UNRRA and other relief agencies, then the food can be absorbed fairly easily and prices will stay at a decent level." (*N. Y. Times*, Sept. 18.) The "problem" will be even worse next year; the Department of Agriculture recently stated that perhaps quotas for 1946 would have to be reduced to maintain prices. The Department has also announced that meat will be available for U. S. civilians this winter at the rate of 150 pounds per person per year, as against average consumption of 126 pounds in 1935-1939 and 136 in 1943. To remove the last obstacle to the American people eating themselves sick this winter, the Government on November 23 abolished rationing of meats, fats butter and oils. Obviously feeling a little ashamed, the Secretary of Agriculture assured the public —falsely as we shall see—that the removal of meat rationing would "in no way" affect the size of shipments to Europe where, he added in the Understatement of the Year, "the average level of food consumption is very much lower than in this country."

The most significant way to measure diets is by calories per day. The rock-bottom healthful diet is probably about 2,000 calories a day, assuming, as is *not* the case abroad, that it includes a proper amount of high-protein foods like meat and fats. Taking this as a yardstick, we find that the American soldier gets almost 4,000 calories a day, the American civilian about 3,300 (and well-balanced), the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Englishman 2,900 (not well-balanced), the Russian 2,000, the Dutchman 1,630, the city-dwelling Frenchman 1,500, the Norwegian 1,115, the Greek 970 and the German from 900 to perhaps 1,300 depending on the zone he lives in and also on whether he gets anything at all.

The National Research Council was recently asked what would be the effect of living on the average diet in Europe today. Its reply: "The judgement of the Board based on evidence available is that adult European males reduced to an intake of 1400-1700 calories for a period of six months will suffer: (1) reduction of capacity for work to the point where only very light work can be performed effectively and heavy work not at all. (2) Loss of power of mental concentration associated with apathy, depression, and a high level of irritability. (3) Increased susceptibility to infections and contagious diseases."

At the University of Minnesota Medical School a study of the effects of semi-starvation is now being completed, with a group of 34 C.O.'s as volunteer guinea pigs. Norman Thomas recently stated: "For six months they were fed at the semi-starvation level, going down to about 1500 calories per day, which millions of Europeans endure. They told me that one effect was to make it extraordinarily difficult for them, in good temper and good judgement, to carry on the simple business of their own small democracy of cooperative living. All intellectual work was made extremely difficult, but the really striking thing is the fact that the men made almost no improvement at all when their diet was raised to the level that is now offered by relief agencies in Europe—2,000 to 2,500 calories. It was only after a very considerable time on a 4,000-calorie diet that real progress was made. The significance of this for the rehabilitation of democracy in Europe is obvious."

The greatest lack in European diets today is fats and oils and meat. In pounds per year, here is how our own current rate of consumption compares with that of various countries abroad:

	FATS & OILS	MEAT
Poland	3	(unknown)
Italy	5	"
France	13 to 20	17
Netherlands	22	28
Belgium	29	15
England	26	94
UNITED STATES	44	148

Some footnotes should be added to this table: (1) The minimum quantity of fats and oils needed to preserve health is 20 pounds a year; thus unless other high-protein foods are available, as they are not in Europe today, the deficiency of countries below this level should be made up by more meat, which they are not getting. (2) Of the present American production of fats and oils, UNRRA is getting exactly 1%. (3) The 617 million pounds of American meat allocated for export to England and the continent in the last quarter of 1945 is 10% of the total supply. (4) The reduction in the Army's requirements of meat—as of many other foodstuffs—in the past year has been greater than the amount of meat we have been shipping overseas; thus American civilians so far have not had to give up anything for overseas relief purposes.

This, then, is the general picture; and it is not a pretty picture. The question now arises: who is responsible?

Who? (1) Congress and the UNRRA Appropriations

On December 5, the Senate passed a bill appropriating $500 millions for the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration (UNRRA). This was the final instalment on the $1,350 millions authorized by Congress last winter as the U. S. contribution to UNRRA. (Each country agreed to contribute 1% of its 1943 national income.) The money was long overdue. UNRRA Director Lehman had asked for it just three months earlier. Because of the delay in Congress, UNRRA had had to cancel more and more purchases of food and clothes and by the end of November was, in Lehman's words, "slowly grinding to a standstill." (The American contribution is about 75% of UNRRA's budget.) Because of the delay, thousands of Poles, Yugoslavs, Italians, Greeks, and Czechs have died of cold and hunger, and thousands more are still dying. For the money is not yet appropriated.

When the House passed the bill on November 1, it attached to it a "free press" amendment barring the use of the funds in countries which do not permit the American press free access in order to report on how the goods are being used. This amendment, put through by the usual combination of Republicans and Southern Democrats, was a pressure move against such Russian-dominated areas as Poland and Yugoslavia. It was also, whether deliberately or not, a way of denying the funds in practice, for UNRRA's constitution does not permit it to make such discriminations, and only a vote of all participating nations can change this constitution—not a vote by the American Congress. The Senate passed the bill without the "free press" amendment. The two bills therefore now must go to a joint committee of both houses, which will have to agree on a single bill, which will then be passed again by both houses and go to Truman for signing.

How long all this will take, no one can say. The effect of the delay on UNRRA has already been catastrophic, nor can this damage be made up. A "pipeline" of supplies must be kept full continuously; if there is a break, then the pipeline "sucks air," and supplies don't arrive for a certain interval. Since it takes about two months from the time an order for foodstuffs is placed over here until the time it arrives in Europe, this means that there will be a break in UNRRA's pipeline during the worst winter months even if Congress passes the appropriation tomorrow. Already half of UNRRA's planned December shipments have been cancelled.

Congress's action, or lack of it, is part of a general pattern of American indifference to UNRRA. The richest country in the world, on which UNRRA depends for three-quarters of its supplies, has consistently been the slowest in providing its share and has put not only the armed forces but also the civilian market ahead of UNRRA when certain foods like meat and fats have been scarce. Today there is a surplus of all kinds of foods, and furthermore a large part of UNRRA's funds, if not the greater part, will be used to buy up the vast surplus supplies accumulated by our armed forces—surpluses which must either be used

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

that way, or destroyed, or thrown onto the domestic market. Yet not a single progressive Senator—not LaFollette, not Wagner, not Pepper, not Murray—has made an issue out of the delay on UNRRA. The reactionaries who want to cut down spending, the *Chicago Tribune* isolationists who don't want Uncle Sam "to play Santa Claus" to a lot of wops and reds have had things all their own way. The final irony is that UNRRA is an American creation: it was founded when the representatives of 44 nations met in the White House on November 8, 1943, to sign the basic agreement.

There is also now pending before Congress a bill to authorize a second contribution of $1,350 millions for UNRRA's work in the coming year. This is the final instalment: when it is spent, UNRRA will go out of existence. The total American contribution will have been $2,700 millions, or less than 1% of the sum spent on fighting the war. This second appropriation will have not only to continue UNRRA's relief work in such nations as Poland and Greece, but will also have to be used to initiate large-scale activities in Italy ($450 millions), China ($800 millions), Austria and perhaps Russia itself. The need in China alone is so huge that no one has attempted a total estimate: the Chinese Government asked for $5 billions, six times what UNRRA plans to spend there.

Unless this second contribution is authorized—and a large part of it appropriated—by the end of this year, Director Lehman has warned that UNRRA will have to suspend operations in February. On November 16, the British Parliament authorized its second UNRRA contribution of $300 millions and voted to appropriate at once $60 millions of it. There was no opposition to the Government's proposal, which was adopted in a few hours. But the American contribution has only just been passed by the House, and the Senate has not even held hearings on it; there is also intense opposition, with all kinds of "free press" amendments and other crippling additions being planned. Some of the leading Congressmen—Senator Connally, the head of the Foreign Relations Committee is one example—have shown in debate that they do not even understand the distinction between the $550 million bill and the $1,350 millions asked for next year. In short, the American Congress is either apathetic on the issue, or else actively opposed to further overseas relief.

Who? 2. *The Administration.*

Even more constantly than his predecessor did, Truman makes a practice of humanitarian public statements and "realistic" actions. "The Happy Hypocrite," printed below, gives an especially glaring example. Despite periodic state-

THE HAPPY HYPOCRITE

"This Government has abundant evidence that the American people are aware of the suffering among our Allies. They have also made plain their determination that this country shall do its full part along with other supplying nations in helping to restore health and strength to those who fought at our side, both in Europe and the Far East. It is an American responsibility not only to our friends but to ourselves to see that the job is done and done quickly."

Thus, President Truman, on the afternoon of September 17, 1945, in a statement which was duly printed on the front pages of the nation's newspapers. What was NOT printed was an account of what the President had said a few hours earlier to a delegation representing 48 national organizations including the CIO, the AFL, the Federal Council of Churches, the General Federation of Women's Clubs, the Farmers' Union, etc. This delegation, which was headed by Mrs. Dwight W. Morrow, chairman of Food for Freedom, secured an appointment with the President, after lengthy negotiations, in order to urge more generous overseas relief for Europe. Their interview with the President was the immediate cause of his issuing the above Noble Words, which contrast rather painfully with what he actually said, in the privacy of his office, to the delegation. The following report has been compiled from three sources: A Worldover Press report of October 24; the Union for Democratic Action News Letter No. 48, by Paul Sifton, one of those present at the interview; and verbal information from some one who got the story of what happened from several of the participants.

Mrs. Morrow was the spokesman for the delegation. Truman's attitude was bristling, hostile; he interrupted her twice in her first sentence. When she spoke of "starvation" in Europe this winter, he interjected impatiently: "not starvation—hunger." A moment later, he cut her short in order to express annoyance with the alleged lack of self-respect and initiative of the people of Europe, who "didn't do things for themselves but just sat around and waited like birds to be fed." Later, he agreed that Congress should appropriate more funds for UNRRA, but said, inaccurately, the USA was reaching the limit of its capacity to help. At the same time, with the callousness which only wellfed heads of states and such dehumanized characters display, he admitted that, even if all the UNRRA funds and other credits his Administration is now requesting should be granted in full, Europe's food supplies would still "remain below the minimum level of subsistence." When Mrs. Morrow mentioned "our" promises to feed the liberated nations after the war, Truman again interrupted: "We didn't promise them anything." Mrs. Morrow: "But President Roosevelt said. . . ." Truman (interrupting): "Well, *I* didn't promise!" At one point, he pulled out a British newspaper from his desk drawer and pointed to its headlines: "*BRITISH FOOD KEEPS EUROPE FROM STARVING*," commenting bitterly — "There you are! That's *our* food, our lend-lease stuff, they're giving them!"

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ments about Shouldering Our Moral Obligations to our Loyal Allies, Truman has entrusted the job of getting the UNRRA appropriation through Congress to the State Department which, under the reactionary Byrnes, has managed to be as ineffectual as possible. Those close to the Washington scene assure me that Truman has put no pressure behind his requests for Congressional action on UNNRA.

When fats, oils and meat were taken off rationing a few weeks ago, Truman's spokesman in the matter, Secretary of Agriculture Anderson, stated that this move would not have any effect on allocations for overseas relief. He pointed out that the Government had the legal authority, rationing or no rationing, to set aside whatever quantities of whatever foodstuffs it deemed essential for this purpose. This is true. It is a restatement of what Truman himself said after the famous September 17 conference with Mrs. Morrow and others: "Should UNRRA secure the additional financial resources it so urgently needs, and should the paying governments conclude more satisfactory financial arrangements . . . both the Department of Agriculture and the War Production Board have the authority to issue 'set aside' orders on specific quantities of commodities purchased, regardless of whether they are rationed, to insure deliveries abroad." This was the first time such authority had been publicly emphasized by the President, and some people hoping for a more generous relief policy have attached the highest importance to this fact, even suggesting that relief shipments will henceforth take the same No. 1 priority position as military supplies did during the war. This seems to me wishful thinking. Authority is one thing and using it is another. The authority has existed all along, and yet to date the food interests have been able to prevent its being used. And if they could do this even when the home market was limited by rationing, will they not bring even greater pressure now that rationing is off and buying power is limited only by people's income and not also by their rationing stamps? Already we have the instance of shoes, which are perhaps more needed in most foreign countries now than even food. Shoes were recently taken off ration. The result was a buying rush which has already produced a shortage in the shoe shops. Can one imagine the Truman Administration now issuing a "set aside" order to insure shoes for Europe?

The cat was let out of the bag on the very day Truman made his statement—that momentous September 17—and by the very man who later had to pretend that the lifting of meat would make no difference to overseas allocations: Secretary of Agriculture Anderson. After the Morrow delegation left, Truman conferred with Anderson. "On his departure from the White House," reported the *N. Y. Times*, "Mr. Anderson said the duration of meat rationing in the United States depended on the amount sent to Europe and other parts of the world. He told reporters there was enough meat in this country to make possible a termination of its rationing by January 1, *depending on European requirements.*" (Italics mine—DM.) Thus the man in the position to know best, after conferring with Truman, made a connection between rationing and European relief which Truman's own statement an hour or two later tried to deny. As the *Times* mildly noted: "A difference of opinion between the President and Mr. Anderson was indicated. . ." Major conclusion: Anderson was speaking as an executive, Truman as a politician. Minor conclusion: this is one of many recent instances of the technical incompetence of the present Administration: Roosevelt might have acted the same way but would have kept the cat in the bag—at least he would not have let it out on the very steps of the White House.

Who? 3. The Food Industry.

It is more profitable for a manufacturer to produce goods for the retail market than in big lots for non-commercial wholesale consumers. It is more profitable to produce higher-priced "quality" goods for the war-rich American buying public than cheap utilitarian goods for Lend-Lease or UNRRA. These elementary facts of economic life are not unknown to the makers of soap, the canners of food, the packers of meat, and all the other businessmen who make the kind of goods needed for overseas relief. Their policy throughout the past few years, in fact, shows clearly enough that they know these things very well. They have brought great pressure to bear, against a Government which put up little resistance anyway, to (1) spike UNRRA and Lend-Lease, and (2) get rationing lifted as speedily as possible. In the fall of 1944, they were able to get points taken off almost all canned goods and reduced on meats and fats. (It may have been that Roosevelt's aspirations to a Fourth Term fitted into their plans; certainly it did the President no harm with the voters to relax rationing just at that point.) The result was that the following spring, after a "brisk" winter season in foodstuffs, a food shortage developed, rationing had to be reimposed, Lend-Lease food commitments were cut in half, and, on June 1, the entire U. S. meat allocation promised to UNRRA was cancelled through September. The sudden termination of Lend-Lease on August 21 by President Truman may also have been partly due to the efforts of the food industry.

There have been more recent instances, namely:

¶ In the last quarter of 1945, UNRRA was officially allocated 19,000 tons of sugar from the USA. In this same period, American civilians are to get 982,000 tons of sugar —*and the soft-drink industry alone will get three times as much sugar as UNRRA.*

¶ The way to make money out of fats and oils is to use them for toilet soaps, brand-name shortenings, 60¢ a pound butter for the rich domestic market. That the people of Europe have skin diseases because they have no soap at all, that their most serious diet deficiency now is fats and oils—these facts do not enter into the businessman's calculations. Therefore, in the final quarter of 1945, UNRRA is getting exactly 1% of our fats and oils. Even this 1% is largely surplus Army stores of canned "stabilized butter" (the GI's called it "unmeltable butter") which couldn't have been sold on the domestic market anyway. In 1944 there was a surplus of lard; the soap companies were allowed to stockpile it, but UNRRA was not. When UNRRA late that year asked the companies to make yellow laundry soap, they refused—perfumed toilet soaps were much more profitable. They finally consented, after a three-star general had pleaded with them, and after UNRRA had turned over to them 20 million pounds of lard it had hoped to ship abroad for food consumption. (Source for the facts on sugar and fats: personal interview with Harold Weston, director of "Food for

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Freedom." Also see article by Dorothy Dunbar Bromley, *N. Y. Herald-Tribune*, Nov. 25.)

¶ But these triumphs are not enough for our food industry. The maximization of profits can know no bounds under capitalism; so long as a single dollar of possible profit is escaping, your true capitalist is worried. So we find spokesmen for the great food companies now demanding direct representation on the Combined Food Board in Washington, on which representatives of Canada, Britain and the U.S.A. determine how much foodstuffs from each country shall be exported and where. Complaining that the Board "has failed to consult officials of manufacturing companies," the industry's spokesmen "point out that it is possible for European nations to exaggerate their needs for scarce foodstuffs, whereas if American manufacturers were consulted, they might be able not only to protect the consumer here but also to show that the demand is too large." (*N. Y. Times*, Nov. 24.) The simplicity, not to say crudity, of this is staggering, when one recalls that Americans are now eating from two to three times as many calories per day as Europeans are. The ignorance of these businessmen is also rather staggering. They complain that the American representative on the Board "is in a position to be outvoted by British and Canadian members," whereas in fact each member has the final say as to what his country's contribution shall be.

¶ American businessmen don't like the whole idea of trading with governments or agencies instead of peddling their trademarked wares direct to the natives. On November 21 Dr. Julius Klein, who was once Hoover's Secretary of Commerce, attacked the various foreign buying missions now in the USA as trying to put over "a determined socialization of our foreign trade operations." Since this method is the only way, at present, any sizable quantity of American goods can be obtained by Europe, Dr. Klein's formula seems to be that Europeans should freeze and starve and go ragged for several years until the fruits of American enterprise can be delivered to them properly trade-marked. One might wonder whether by that time such Europeans as have managed to survive will be in a receptive mood towards products labelled "Made in USA."

Why?

The immediate reason for the failure of the USA to give decent help to Europe is that, while a statistical majority of Americans are in favor of such help, they don't care enough about it and are not organized so as to make their wishes overbalance the inertia of private-capitalist ways of doing things and the intense opposition of an organized minority.

A Gallup Poll taken in April, 1945, showed that 65% of the people were then willing to put up with shortages and continued rationing in order to send more aid to the liberated countries of Europe. The big farm groups are in favor of more aid, since it means more demand for farm products and thus better prices. Organized labor, the churches, and the liberals are also for more aid, but none of these groups has made it a big national issue. Labor is more excited about the relatively trivial question of whether the automobile workers—the poorest paid of whom lives on a scale that would be considered luxurious in Europe today—get a raise or not; the liberals worry more about the misery of a Kremlin which is denied the atomic bomb; the people as a whole, while their hearts seem to be "in the right place," have not themselves known severe privation during the war, as the British people for example have, and thus seem to have little sense of what things are like abroad this winter. And so the food interests, the reactionary isolationists, *and* the certified public accountants have it all their own way.

But there must be deeper currents here, too. For the present starvation policy runs counter to strong arguments of economic and imperialistic self-interest. On November 16, Lehman, pleading for UNRRA before a hostile House committee, tried the "hard-headed businessman" line: (1) only UNRRA can avert pestilence, chaos and revolution which will threaten our military position in Europe; (2) UNRRA's constitution provides that 90% of each country's contribution be spent within that country, so that UNRRA will help avert a postwar depression here; (3) much if not most of the money will be spent to buy military surpluses in this country, thus holding them off the market. He might have added that if the USA is to play the dominating imperialistic role in the postwar world which her political security and her economic prosperity demand, she must use her riches the way Hoover used food in the last war: to bind friends closer, to bribe such hostile elements as can be bribed and to bring pressure on the incorruptibles. The retreat into isolationism after the last war is much talked about, and yet, on the relief level at least, this time we seem to be going even further. The Hoover organization at least fed the counter-revolutionaries; but this time the USA is letting friend and foe starve to death with magnificent impartiality.

Or compare the American and the Nazi policies in Europe.

"TOO DAMNED FAT"

"I have spent two weeks at Camp Charlotte, France, doing nothing and looking forward to at least a month before going home for a discharge.

"But I am getting too damn fat. Why does the Army put out so much food to the redeployed soldier? With a lot of women, children, grown men, etc., in Europe on the verge of starvation, why do they insist on fattening us up like pigs?

"Please bring more for folks over here who need it and less for me."

(Letter in "Stars & Stripes", as quoted in "N. Y. Times", Nov. 15)

WHY?

Sirs:

I lost my fear of death at Guadalcanal. I lost my best friend on Okinawa. I lost my leg at Iwo. And I lost my faith in American democracy after reading your article on displaced German persons (LIFE, Oct. 15). What *was* I fighting for?

Ensign John Henry Holt, USNR

San Francisco, Calif.

(Letter to the Editors of "Life", Nov. 12)

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Evidence is accumulating that the Nazis did a remarkably competent job of making Europe self-sufficient in food during their occupation. They reorganized agriculture, changing over from livestock to cereal crops for direct human consumption, and thus providing a more economical if less attractive diet. They even partly solved the fats problem by increasing the acreage of crops like rape seed. Regions like Greece and Yugoslavia which were of no economic importance to them, they looted and stripped ruthlessly, allowing the populations to die of famine. But they saw to it that the industrially important nations were fed. Thus they shipped 25,000 tons of food and consumer goods a day into Belgium (cut to 10,000 tons after the pre-invasion Allied bombings that disrupted communications). After we moved into Belgium in the fall of 1944, we shipped in 480 tons a day — and commandeered all the surviving rolling-stock! *Time* of March 26, 1945, stated that up to then, the USA had sent to "liberated" Europe only 10% of the food and supplies that had been furnished to "enslaved" Europe by the Nazis. The immediate reason for the contrast is, of course, that the Nazis needed European armament production and we did not. This is not a very impressive reason from an ethical standpoint, since it comes down to both sides feeding only those whom it needed. But we are concerned at this point not with ethics but with practical politics. And from that standpoint, one would expect that a rich nation which aspires to play a world role would have made some plans to keep the European living standard at least on the level it had under the Nazis, if only to avoid being hated even more than the Nazis were.

It is just this kind of imagination, which the Nazis had, the Romans had, the British have, and all empire-builders have which seems to be lacking in the American ruling class. The results are paradoxical. On the one hand, the usual Marxist view of the USA as an aggressive world-imperialism seems incorrect; in the early twenties, Trotsky predicted that the USA would soon directly dominate Europe; yet even after the *second* world war, when the USA is relatively even mightier than she was last time, this perfectly logical Marxist expectation seems not to be coming true; our foreign policy is weak and confused and our armies are being pulled out as fast as possible. On the other hand, this abstention from imperialism is due to no superior democratic virtue of the Americans, but simply to a cultural lag so profound that one wonders whether it will ever be overcome. Our armies think the rest of the world is just funny, and want nothing out of the war except to get back home as fast as possible. Our businessmen still think in terms of a self-sufficient domestic economy, though all economists agree that only foreign trade on an enormous scale can sustain prosperity in the postwar decades. Our politicians boggle for three months over a few hundred millions for UNRRA. It would seem that the rest of the world simply is not real to us Americans, that we are neither imperialists nor internationalists but just—provincials. It is not the least grim aspect of Europe's tragedy that the one nation able to give her economic help should not even know that she exists.

The German Horror

Unless there is a drastic change of Allied policy in Germany, millions of German civilians—most of them old people, women and young children—will starve and freeze to death. The self-styled "antifascist" victors will have perpetrated a horror on a scale approaching if not exceeding anything the Nazis ever did. By October 1, the death rate in Berlin was 10 times the prewar rate; it will increase as winter sets in; children under 3 get ½ pint of milk a day, children over 3 no milk; returning soldiers tell of city streets littered with the dead and dying, suicides hanging from thousands of trees around Berlin; official reports state that many Germans in the French zone are dying on 900 calories a day, that in "liberated" Vienna the level is 760 calories, (less than half the minimum for survival), that the millions of German refugees from the East wandering around the Russian zone get no rations at all; Bertrand Russell states (and I have seen letters from Berlin which bear him out) that "In the Russian zone practically every woman between 15 and 50 has been raped, and between 20% and 50% have been infected with venereal disease" *(The New Leader*, Dec. 8).

From time to time official investigations are made and reports issued. These reports—recent examples are: that of the Anglo-American-French nutritionists' committee *(N. Y. Herald-Tribune*, Nov. 4); that of Gen. Lucius Clay, American Deputy Military Governor, asking for 300,000 tons of food to be sent in from the U. S. A. (Nov. 6); and that of Byron Price to President Truman (Nov. 28)—all say the same thing. Food must be sent into Germany on a massive scale if famine is to be avoided. Nothing seems to result from these reports except reassuring statements that "it is not our intention to starve the German people." But whether it is our intention or not, that is what is happening. A glimpse into the real official attitude is afforded by the remarks last July of Col. Frank L. Howley (described as "a plainspoken cavalryman from Philadelphia"), then and perhaps still American Military Governor of Berlin: *"The Germans are not getting namby-pamby treatment. We are not bringing in food because we love them. It's because we don't want them starving and having their stinking bodies infect our troops."* The Colonel added that the Germans were getting the non-namby-pamby ration of 1100 calories a day.

> ***Meanwhile, we can and will arrange in advance for the speedy entry of food into any part of the enslaved area . . . so that there will always be held up before the eyes of the peoples of Europe including—I say it deliberately—the German and Austrian peoples the certainty that the shattering of the Nazi power will bring to them all immediate food, freedom and peace.***
>
> *(Winston Churchill, August 1940)*
>
> **Already the people of this skeleton city are dying at the rate of 61 per 1,000—more than six times the normal toll. But as winter closes in, the wastage of human life will rise swiftly. . . . The infant mortality rate over three months this summer was 594 per thousand (over 50%). For the corresponding period last year: 60 per thousand.**
>
> **(Berlin correspondent of the London "Daily Mirror", October 2).**

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

At best, it would seem that the Allies look on the German people today as a farmer looks on his horses: as a source of labor power. They put the able-bodied males to work as slave laborers, and let the rest live or die as they can. Our Army's reaction to the agony of the refugees from the East was described in the *N. Y. Times* of Oct. 29: "Wary of any Russian attempt to send the worst physical specimens West, the United States has already told the Russians that refugees headed for the American zone 'must be fit or we won't accept them.'" The moral results of this are atrocious: if there is such a thing as collective war guilt, which I personally deny, then it is clearly the able-bodied men who must bear it. Only a Jesuit—or a certain type of liberal journalist—could fix moral blame for Nazism on babies and children. Yet it is precisely the infants and their mothers whom the victorious "anti-fascists" are condemning to death.

Potsdam Was Utopian!

At Potsdam, the Big Three drew up Genghis Khan terms for defeated Germany. *The Economist* characterized them: "At the end of a mighty war fought to defeat Hitlerism, the Allies are making a Hitlerian peace. This is the real measure of their failure . . . The Potsdam settlement will not last ten years, and when it breaks down there will be nothing but the razor-edge balance of international anarchy between civilization and the atomic bomb."

It might seem that this is bad enough. But one of the peculiarities of history today is that things get progressively worse, so that one thinks well we've hit bottom now, we can't go lower than this—only to find a few weeks later that a new bottom has been reached. So with Potsdam. Compared to what is actually happening in Germany, the Potsdam Agreement was a humane, even a Utopian document. For while its drastic penalties are all being carried out to the letter or beyond, certain elementary safeguards which its authors—whether from hypocrisy, fear of public opinion at home, realism, or even some remnant of human feeling—inserted into it have been disregarded.

Potsdam says: "During the period of occupation, Germany shall be treated as a single economic unit." Actually, the four zones are run as separate autonomous units, with no central control or even coordination of transport, production, or distribution. This is because the French (who were not allowed to be in on Potsdam but who, illogically, *are* allowed to vote with the Big Three on occupation policy—which requires unanimity for all decisions) have so far vetoed all proposals for centralization because the DeGaulle Government fears Germany might become too powerful. The result is that the most highly integrated economy in Europe is paralyzed, and the Germans are hungering even more than they would otherwise. The result also is that another Potsdam provision, that "there shall be uniformity of treatment of the German population throughout Germany," is a dead letter. The Germans in the French zone are slowly starving to death on rations of as little as 900 calories per day (see summary of a recent official Allied report, in *N. Y. Herald-Tribune,* Nov. 5) while those in the British and American zones are living somewhat better, and those in the Russian zone—including no one knows how many millions of dispossessed families from the East—are also starving, and not slowly.

Potsdam says: the Allies are aiming "to prepare for the eventual reconstruction of German life on a democratic basis and for eventual peaceful cooperation in international life for Germany." Only a nation composed wholly of saints could endure the treatment the Germans are getting and come out of it a democratic and peaceable people. And while I don't think the German people are any farther from this ideal than we Americans, I don't think they are any closer to it either—and I know that most of us are not saints.

Potsdam says: "The three Governments recognize that the transfer to Germany of German populations . . . remaining in Poland, Czechoslovakia and Hungary will have to be undertaken. They agree that any transfers that take place should be effected in an orderly and humane manner." The material given below will show how "orderly and humane" the transfers have been. The Potsdam conferees, after examining reports on the expulsions up to then, also felt it necessary to "request" the Czech, Polish and Hungarian governments to suspend them for a while. (The misery of the expelled Germans must have been indeed striking if even the Potsdam statesmen were appalled by it.) For a time the expulsions were somewhat slowed down, but after the failure of the London Conference of Foreign Ministers, the Russians—who have the power to permit or forbid them, since their armies control the area—allowed the migrations to begin again on a big scale, and they are still going on as winter draws in. *The Economist* of Oct. 13 reports that the expulsions are going on in full force, adding: "A new wave, millions strong, is to be poured into rump-Germany. Millions are already milling about and dying in the Russian zone . . . If another inrush engulfs what little organization there is for dealing with these people, there will be an appalling famine in Germany this winter . . . The first priority in any policy for Germany is thus to persuade the Russians, Czechs and Poles to stop the expulsions."

It is no exaggeration to say that, so far as one may judge from press reports, the inhumanity of the oppressors and the torments of the victims are already on a scale com-

"All around Potsdam, German families are living on a diet largely of potatoes and irregular bread, but within the heavily guarded compound provided for the American delegation there are two 10-ton mobile refrigerators and they are full of the best cuts of meat. This with fresh fruit, strawberries, melons, tomatoes and hearts of lettuce will be served today and henceforth. Two dieticians are watching the balance of calories and vitamins. Ice is being brought in from Berlin to cool the drinks, and these drinks will include every kind of wine and spirits and liqueurs. Supply convoys have brought in stoves for cooking and the American air force flew in 20 refrigerators. . . . In addition, there are . . . 150 bottles of button polish, 5,000 linen sheets, 500 corkscrews and bottle-openers, 1,000 white coats for waiters."

(British Broadcast from Potsdam last August, as quoted in letter by Victor Gollancz in *The Manchester Guardian* of August 9.)

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

parable to Maidanek, Oswiecsm, and Belsen. And if the thing goes on through winter, the number of deaths may outstrip those in the Nazi death-camps.

Potsdam also says that (1) Germany is to be stripped of most of her heavy industry and is to be "pastoralized"; (2) she is to lose to Poland and Russia—has lost, in fact—that third of her territory which is most productive agriculturally; (3) she is to accommodate within her shrunken borders from 10 to 12 million more people from her lost Eastern provinces; and (4) she is to be left "enough resources to enable the German people to subsist without external assistance." The first three of these proposals are obviously incompatible with the fourth. This article does not pretend to treat of matters of long-range policy—Louis Clair dealt with this in his "The Peace Criminals" in the August issue—so I shall merely note here that much of the present misery in Germany is the direct result of the Potsdam policy, and that the contradiction indicated above is a specially good example of what might be called "Potsdam thinking."

This kind of thinking has always been characteristic of the Governments of the two big democracies; it is now becoming monstrous. The essence of "Potsdam thinking" is to adopt policies which must lead to certain results and then to close one's (official) eye to these results if they threaten to become too inhuman—as, in the present case, the death of millions of people and the permanent undernourishment of the survivors. The same thing is happening in Japan, where, as any economist knows, only massive imports can keep alive the present population, and where the Allies have so far neither permitted relief imports nor shown any way for the Japanese to get imports in the future. Little has appeared in the press about the impending mass-starvation in Japan this winter, but I am told the Quakers, who have sources of information on the spot, consider there will be greater starvation there than even in Europe, and that a prominent British authority on Japan has in conversation made an estimate of 10 million deaths from hunger this winter. (I hope to present a study of this neglected subject, by an expert student of Japan, in an early issue.)

The Nazis were less hypocritical: when they decided to kill the Jews of Europe, they organized mass executions by gas chambers. "Our" side seems to have adopted rather the method first used on a large scale in Russia: to apply to millions of people policies which, while not directly killing them, mean that the great majority of them will perish in a short time of cold, hunger and privation. Thus the Stalin regime treated the kulaks in 1932, the political opposition in 1937-8, and hundreds of thousands of Poles and Baltic peoples in 1939-40. Thus we are now treating the peoples of Germany and Japan. As the Congressional Committee headed by Rep. Colmer, in advocating a revision of the Potsdam terms, put it: "If a hard peace requires the elimination of 8 or 10 millions of Germans, it would be much more humane to eliminate them at once."

X Million Wanderers

No one knows even approximately how many millions of women, children, youths and old men are wandering over the roads of Eastern Germany this winter. In those parts of Germany ceded to Russia and Poland, and in the areas of Hungary and Czechoslovakia from which all inhabitants of German blood are being expelled there are about twelve million Germans. Estimates on the number that have been forcibly expelled already range from five to ten millions. But no one knows because no control is exercised, no statistics or records are kept, no transport is provided in most cases, and no organization has been set up to tell these people where to go, or to feed and house them on their wanderings. The Poles and Czechs have simply emptied one town or village after another of all their inhabitants—families which have often lived there for generations, centuries—and pushed out onto the roads on a few hours or even 15 minutes notice the whole population with as much of their possessions as they can carry in their own hands. These hordes then start their wanderings over the roads or crammed into cattle cars from which the dead are removed at each stop. They mostly drift Westward, to Berlin, which cannot feed its own remaining 2 million inhabitants and does not permit them to stay more than 24 hours unless they have become hospital cases. The peasants and townspeople along their routes, starving themselves, have nothing to give them and repulse them brutally. None of the occupying powers concerns itself with them; they have no ration cards, in a land where ration cards mean life, no refuge, no destination, no hope.

Here are some first-hand reports of what is happening to these X millions.

"There is no doubt that an appalling slaughter is going on. Every effort is made to keep the refugees out of Berlin, but train-loads of stowaways still get through, and a correspondent-friend describes the scenes at the railway station as being like Belsen all over again—carts taking the dead from the platform and so on. I have never seen a hard-boiled pressman so near to tears." (*Letter from Friends Ambulance Unit Member; Berlin, Aug. 23.*)

"Under the bomb-wrecked roof of Berlin's great Stettiner Railway Station, I looked this afternoon inside a cattle truck . . . four dead forms under blankets . . . in another corner, four more, all women, were dying . . . As I walked about the station a score of others came up to me, all ravenous and starved, for whom also, like those in the cattle-truck mortuary, nothing could be done — until death . . .

"Those people in the cattle truck, and hundreds more who lay on bundles of belongings on the platform, were the dead and dying and starving flotsam left by the tide of human misery that daily reaches Berlin, and next day is turned back to take train to another town in a hopeless search for food. Thousands more—up to 25,000 a day—trek on foot to the outskirts of Berlin, where they are stopped and forbidden entry . . .

"The Allies have made no move to render relief or even give the Berlin Social Welfare Organization, with its staff of 33 and 220 helpers all told, any assistance whatever . . . Here in Berlin, we are living under this shadow, not just of hunger and want, but of death, and epidemics on a scale the world has not seen in recorded history." (*Norman Clark, in the London "News Chronicle," August 24.*)

"In the Robert Koch Hospital here, which I visited this morning, there are more than sixty German women and children, many of whom were summarily evicted from a hospital and an orphanage in Danzig last month, and, without food and water or even straw to lie on, were dispatched in cattle trucks to Germany. When the train

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

NOEL! NOEL!

Just right for making their meals on, saves much confusion—our own handpainted baby lamb design on a plastic tray. $14.95 Sixth Floor.

(Christmas Catalog from Lord & Taylor, New York City, 1945.)

In Berlin a German woman refugee from Pomerania broke down and wept in an embarassing and rather dreadful gratitude when I gave her a small tin of condensed milk for her child, who, she said—and whose looks bore out her words—had had virtually no food for three days.

("Manchester Guardian," Oct. 15).

Did you hear her say she wanted a warm and pretty-making negligee? Here it is—our all-wool Botany brand robe with rayon crepe panels. Aqua with fuchsia, purple with cerise, chartreuse with Chinese red, cerise with petal blue. $35. Fourth Floor.

Women have been seen in Berlin straining the waste water from the kitchen sink of a house where there was an Allied mess. ("Manchester Guardian", Oct. 15).

What woman wouldn't give her eyeteeth for a three-quarter length striped wild Canadian mink coat with the new sleeve fulness. $3,500. Third Floor.

arrived in Berlin, they said that of 83 persons crammed into two of the trucks, 20 were dead." (*Berlin Correspondent of the London "Times," Sept. 10.*)

"This is what a British major has to say:

" 'The greatest horror in modern history is taking place in Eastern Germany. Many millions of German people have been ejected on to the roads . . . are dying by the thousand on the roads from starvation, dysentery and exhaustion. Even a cursory visit to the hospitals in Berlin . . . is an experience which would make the sights in the concentration camps appear normal.' (*London "Daily Mirror," Oct. 4*)

"They (the inhabitants of Eastern Germany) were ejected forcibly from their homes, pushed out by blows with rifle-butts and with kicks. The small amount of luggage they managed to bundle together was either stolen or wantonly destroyed during the repeated encounters they suffered on the way. To the physical torments and fatigues they suffered was added mental distress: nearly all the women and girls had very often to pay 'body toll' on the route. Many of them thus contracted venereal disease . . . One mother who, as she crossed the frontier, was raped several times in the presence of her children, believing that she would never be able to survive the shame, tried to open the arteries of herself and her three children. The attempt failed, and the consequence is that all three children now have a crippled hand with which to reproach their mother for the rest of their lives.*

"So swarms of people are dragging themselves across the space between the Elbe and the Oder, from East to West, and again from West to East, from South and North, and back again. The greatest need is for an organization of a central organization and such a State authority as could direct the stream of refugees.

"The aimless wandering takes the last courage from people. Many bring their lives to an end. In the forest around Berlin, countless dead are hanging from the trees. One becomes indifferent to death. Mothers see their children die and bury them by the wayside, apparently with none of that pain which usually tears a mother's heart apart.* . . . If this misery cannot be checked, it is no exaggeration to reckon on a figure of 20 million dead this winter."

(*Probst Gruber, former inmate of a concentration camp, in "The Friend" (London), Oct. 12.*)

The chief responsibility for these horrors belongs to the Russians who have permitted the mass expulsions to take place and in whose zone the majority of these wanderers are slowly dying. Now the Russians are, as is well known, a primitive, semi-Asiatic people whose national traditions and present totalitarian government combine to place a low estimate on human life. But what about *us*, who are so much more sensitive to the value and rights of the individual human being? *We* don't expel the Germans, *we* don't send them out to freeze and starve on the wintry roads and in the jammed cattle-cars. Since we don't need their land or goods, we can play an even more despicable role: that of Pilate, who permitted injustice not because he profited directly by it but simply because it was more expedient.

And the governor said, "Why, what evil hath he done?" But they cried out the more saying: "Let him be crucified!" When Pilate saw that he could prevail nothing, but that rather a tumult was made, he took water and washed his hands before the multitude, saying, "I am innocent of the blood of this just person—see ye to it." . . . And when he had scourged Jesus, he delivered him to be crucified.

It will take a great deal of water, more than we can ever get, to wash from our hands the blood of the X millions of Germans who will perish this winter because of our expedient indifference.

Postscript: What Are We Going to Do About It?

A. WHAT NEEDS TO BE DONE?

1. Congress should pass the $550 million UNRRA 1945 appropriation at once, and the $1,350,000,000 1946 authorization before the end of this year.

2. The State Department should direct the Army to dispose at once of the $3 billions worth of usable surplus supplies now in Europe, on whatever terms the European governments will offer.

3. To avert famine in Germany and Japan, the State Department should:

(a) reopen the mails, so that Americans may send in food packages to individuals in enemy countries.

* A three to nine-fold increase in syphilis is reported in most European countries, and a twenty-fold increase in Germany." (*N. Y. Times dispatch from London, Nov. 27*)

* Or else the parents commit suicide because orphans get additional food benefits in many areas. There are many of these "artificial" orphans (or shall we say "planned" orphans?) today in Germany according to the American Friends Service Committee. (See *N. Y. World Telegram, Nov. 30.*)

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

(b) permit the private relief agencies—which have been begging for months to be allowed in—to bring help to German and Japanese civilians.

(c) ship in enough American food to prevent starvation.

4. Individual Americans should contribute food, clothing and cash to private relief campaigns and agencies.

B. WHAT IS BEING DONE?

Those who want to know more about this question, and to do something themselves, should know about the following organizations:

American Friends Service Committee, 20 South 12th St., Philadelphia 7, Pa. *On Nov. 30 the Friends ("Quakers") launched a national campaign to open the mails to Germany and to get permission for private agencies to work there. In the first weeks, six thousand letters came in, all except half a dozen endorsing the Quakers' campaign.*

Cooperative for American Remittances to Europe ("CARE"), 122 East 22 St., New York City. *CARE has just been set up by 22 relief agencies, with a $1 million initial budget. It is headed by Murray D. Lincoln, president of the Cooperative League of the U. S. It plans to buy some 5,000,000 surplus 40-pound Army ration packages, each containing 30 full meals. Americans can have these sent to individuals abroad by CARE for $10 a package, including shipping charges. CARE (which "hopes to serve Germany and Austria eventually") will probably start shipping early in February. It is a pity such an excellent project was not started earlier, but better late than never.*

Food for Freedom, 1707 H Street N. W., Washington 6, D. C. (Harold Weston, Director). *An information-gathering and coordinating committee sponsored by such organizations as the Federal Council of Churches, the National Farmers Union, the CIO and the AFL. Has worked mostly on UNRRA appropriations. Journalists will find its material of great value.*

Save Europe Now, 144 Southampton Row, London W.C.1, England. *Founded last August by Victor Gollancz, Bertrand Russell, Gilbert Murray and other British liberals, this committee has aroused mass support for a more generous food policy in Europe, especially in Germany. Over 55,000 persons have offered to share their scanty rations with European famine areas. It has circulated information on what has been happening in Germany which has not appeared over here. That no such humanitarian campaign has been put on by American liberals is sadly significant.*

NOTE TO THE READER

The above article is being reprinted as a pamphlet. Copies may be ordered now at 10 cents a copy, $1 for 20, $5 for 100.

Because the human suffering is so great, and the full story so little known over here, we hope our readers will order as big bundles as possible of the pamphlet for distribution among groups or organizations with which they are in contact.

Letter to Judge

Hon. Charles J. Vogel,
U. S. District Court,
Minot, N. Dakota

Dear Mr. Vogel:

I appear in court for breaking a regulation of the Selective Service System by "walking out" of Civilian Public Service Camp No. 94 at Trenton, N. D.

As you can see from a letter which I sent to the Attorney General at the time I left camp, I left intentionally for what I consider moral reasons and am aware that I have violated federal law. I am not acquainted with legal method, but do not request legal assistance, largely because I am not appealing to the laws or the constitution of the United States in defence of my action, but rather to a consideration of the needs of our time and necessary steps towards meeting them. My action is an application of the same principles of human responsibility and individual freedom that, I believe, were in the minds of those who framed the Constitution.

In my evaluation of the problems of our time, it had seemed to me that my greatest contribution could be made by healthful family living as a responsible citizen in close neighborly relationships with common folk. At the same time I would attempt to work out patterns for applying a philosophy of interdependence to local and world problems. I was gradually deciding to settle in Macedonia Cooperative Community in the hills of Northeastern Georgia and had spent about fifteen months there, largely in contributed labor.

When the war came, I accepted induction into Civilian Public Service as inevitable for a pacifist. I was confused by such concepts as "this is an improvement in recognition for Conscientious Objectors over that in the last war," "in Civilian Public Service, pacifists can do constructive work in time of war," and "the majority of the people have the right to demand national service, either military or civilian, of the citizens of the country."

With only slight protest I sacrificed the things which I had thought fundamental in my own living—healthful family living, neighborliness to common folk, and the working out of new patterns of living—out of belief in the above concepts. I worked hard at the projects assigned me and spent altogether thirty-one months in the CPS program.

I now feel that CPS, as the internment of Conscientious Objectors by a wartime government, exists only to assert the state's authority to final jurisdiction over the individual to direct his living, even though professing to recognize a particular scruple of conscience. It was a serious mistake to abandon the constructive way of living which I felt my contribution to solving the complex problems facing us. It is in attempt to rectify that mistake that I have left CPS to resume normal constructive living.

I am convinced that the work I am doing managing a dairy in a cooperative community and delivering milk to children as a part of a hot lunch program is far more important than any work I've done in CPS, and am confident that anyone making a careful comparison would reach the same conclusion. While getting milk to children who did not have it before, some of whom could not secure it from any other source, I am at the same time assisting in the establishment of an agricultural pattern in the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

region which conserves the resources, am helping to demonstrate a more abundant economic method, am cooperating with county, state and national agencies to improve the region, and am establishing a family where our children will have sound values and a sense of security. In CPS I was doing few of these things and was chiefly a laborer without responsibility following the orders of government men above me. Perhaps the chief difference is that now as a husband and citizen I am working with my fellows using local resources to better our locality and in that way our part of the world, while in CPS as a conscript I was furthering reliance on government direction. The judgement of most people, I believe, would concur with mine with respect to the comparative value of the work I have just been doing and that which I left in CPS.

Though my position seems absolute, I think of my relation to the government in relative terms. Regulations vary in nature. Where the regulations concern sanitary measures and traffic codes, for example, I often accede to the judgment of others even though it differs from mine. But such regulations do not require me to do something which I consider seriously harmful: they are in considerable contrast to the regulations demanding that I compromise my basic philosophy.

More important, the function of government itself is involved. Government can be defined as the organization of people for their mutual benefit, and much of our government activity is of that nature. In modern history, however, the chief function of the nation-state seems to be becoming one of preparation and prosecution of war to the end of increasing its power relative to that of other nation states. National conscription and heavy armament programs are becoming typical of the modern state. Instead of the state being organized for the good of the people, the people are being organized for the good of the state. I believe that those parts of our government that are carrying us in that direction should be opposed rather than supported. I consider Selective Service to be such a part.

Since CPS is directed by the Selective Service System, I found myself participating in a program to which I was opposed on principle. It raised in my mind the question, have the representatives of the government the right to demand that a person do something against his best judgment? Clearly they believed they had the right or even the responsibility to order me into CPS, regardless of my judgment—and their belief has been supported by the opinion of the Supreme Court with respect to assignment to CPS.

Legally, I am aware, I will be held at fault for disrespect to the law of the United States. I should like to pose for your consideration, however, the ethical problem which confronts me. The government's representatives have directed me to abandon what I consider my chief contribution to society in order to accept a pattern of activity (Civilian Public Service) and an assumption underlying it (the individual is at the government's disposal) which I consider ominously fascist. Am I to be responsible to the standards of action actively required by some and passively accepted by others in the country, or to my own judgment and standards of action?

This is a personal problem, but it is significant in relation to current world problems. It seems clear that one of the chief contributions to the crisis in western civilization is the diminishing of individual responsibility and in its place the substitution of state direction and control. While it seems difficult to see this in our own country, it is easy enough to see in the Nazi and Fascist developments in Germany and Italy. While the dangers of "anarchy" are easily seen and quickly mentioned, the dangers in conscript uniformity are obscured and little considered.

Lao-Tse says, "When people lost sight of the way to live came codes of love and honesty. . . ." So it seems to me that while our problems arise from individual exploitation, confusion and irresponsibility, people look to the state and compliance to the state's regulations for their solution. This serves to increase rather than solve the problems. In an essay, "The Responsibility of Peoples", Dwight Macdonald quotes a correspondent interviewing an official of a death camp captured by the Russian Army from the Germans.

"Q. Did you kill people in the Camp?
A. Yes.
Q. Did you poison them with gas?
A. Yes.
Q. Did you bury them alive?
A. It sometimes happened.
Q. Did you personally kill people?
A. Absolutely not. I was only paymaster of the camp.
Q. What did you think of what was going on?
A. It was bad at first, but we got used to it.
Q. Do you know the Russians will hang you?
A. (Bursting into tears) Why should they? What have I done?"

And Macdonald comments, "*What have I done?* These words ring true. One feels the worthy paymaster . . . is sincerely outraged by the proposal to hang him for his part in killing several million human beings. What had he done indeed? Simply obeyed orders and kept his mouth shut. It was what he had *not* done that shocks our moral sensibilities."

We can say that the paymaster was obligated to humanity above his obligation to his superiors and that he should have died, if need be, before he followed his orders. Yet how quickly we say that an individual has no right to make his own decisions when he opposes the opinion of the majority or the regulation of the United States government.

The paymaster's acquiescence to orders that at first repelled him made possible in part the functioning of the death camp. Even so, I believe, war and fascism are made possible by the acquiescence of large numbers of people to things to which they are at first opposed.

It has become clear to me that I am obligated to live in the manner which I believe right and to refuse to participate in any program or activity which I believe wrong. This may lead me into conflict with the contemporary government, but I believe it to be best in the long run for the people as a whole.

Sincerely,

ARTHUR WISER.

Note by a friend: Art read this statement to Federal Judge Vogel at Minot, North Dakota on October 19, 1945. *Judge Vogel replied by saying that he shuddered to think what might be our situation if many had held such views. He sentenced Art to* 18 *months in a federal correctional institution, explaining as he did so that although he recognized Art's honesty and sincerity he had no alternative to enforcing the law, and that Art could apply for parole. In like manner, the judge sentenced at the same session three others who had left the same camp for similar reasons.*

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Decline of the French Communists

by Gelo and Andrea

France, October 12

The recent cantonal elections show that the French Communist Party has passed the peak of its success and is beginning to lose ground.

Even if the CP has electoral successes in the future, they will be merely the last impetus of the ebbing wave. Only some unpredictable new course of events can alter the consciousness of the masses enough to allow the CP to advance once more. This means that the CP's growth, which not so long ago seemed destined to mount irresistibly, has been checked before the Party has been able to consolidate that quasi-monopolistic control over the anti-capitalist masses which it needed in order to realize its political aim: namely, to control, by legal methods, the French State and French society in order to convert them into a dependable bastion—both militarily and industrially—of the Soviet Union.

But now, alongside the CP, the Socialist Party has once more risen, recovering from its weakness during the Resistance and the early post-Resistance periods. The SP has even become the real pivot of the politics of the Fourth Republic. In a word, the policies of the CP have failed.

The CP during the Resistance

During the German occupation, the activities of the CP were determined mostly by political considerations—just as the Resistance in general was more a political than a military phenomenon. Without the resistance, the war would hardly have been much different, but France could not have maintained herself as an independent nation vis-a-vis the Allies. Likewise, the CP's task was not to relieve the pressure on the Russian Front, since the enemy forces which it could divert could never have been important enough. Its task was, on the contrary, to lay the foundations for strong Russian advance positions in post-war France and in Western Europe generally. This demanded a predominant position of the CP in French society, and its participation in the resistance movement aimed at preparing this position.

Through the determined activities and the courageous attitudes of their militant members, the Communists became indeed indispensable, thus conquering a kind of overall control position. But contrary to their hopes, this did not yet assure them of an analogous position in the post-liberation society. Since the large majority of the population had remained inactive during the occupation, and now entered into political life, the Communists had only two alternatives: either violence, or the increase of their influence upon that majority.

The General Line after the Liberation

There was a strong tendency within the CP immediately after liberation to gain predominant influence through the military and political institutions which had come out of the Resistance and were largely CP dominated. But this would have meant political struggles which could have culminated in civil war and intervention by the Anglo-Saxon powers.

Immediately after his return from Moscow, therefore, Thorez condemned this tendency in his famous speech of January, 1945. This turn, however, did not mean a concession to de Gaulle to strengthen him in his pro-Russian orientation. Its real sense was to indicate to the party that it should follow the legal road to attain, if not complete power, at least control over the society.

It first seemed as if this orientation would enable the CP to attain its goal. The number of its members grew at a formidable pace and in the summer of '45 reached one million. Their influence in the factories increased considerably. Nearly everywhere they succeeded in dominating the factory committees, and the management of those factories which had been taken over by the state from collaborationist owners. The CGT (Trade Union Federation), which now had more than five million members and thus occupied a key position in French society, fell more and more under their control.

The results of the municipal elections in April seemed to prove definitely that the Communists would be able to rally the majority of the working-class and lower-middle-classes, and to attain control of society by parliamentary means. But this presupposed that no other party following a policy different from that of the CP, especially in the foreign field, could develop within the anti-capitalist masses. Concretely speaking, it was of capital importance for the Communists to force the SFIO (Socialist Party) into organic unity with them, or to provoke a split in order to reduce it to insignificance. Here again it seemed that the new wave of Communist influence that had started in Spring and became particularly powerful in June-July, would help them to attain this goal. The workers organized in the SFIO asked more and more impatiently that there be unity with the CP so as to prevent a de Gaulle dictatorship. The leadership of the SFIO certainly never considered organic unity as a real possibility. But this is exactly why a split at the August Congress of the SFIO would not have been totally impossible.

The Limit is Reached

The united working-class party which was supposed to deal the death blow to the SFIO and to open the way for a large-scale penetration into hitherto untouched lower-middle-class circles, was never created, nor was the SFIO split. This was a bitter pill for the Communists. It became evident now not only that a considerable part of the anti-capitalist lower-middle-classes was beyond their influence, but even that their influence on the workers was not all-powerful, and had even begun to decline.

The strengthening of the SFIO—which had been so shaky only shortly before—was due both to the victory of the British Labor Party and to the return of its leader, Leon Blum, from a German concentration camp. The coming to power of the British socialists strengthened the SFIO in the same way as the existence of Russia has strengthened the CP. The Socialist militants in the factories and unions, who had so strongly felt their isolation in the face of crushing Communist majorities, now gained new forces through the belief that the power relationships would soon change. Blum, on the other hand, with his sharp political intuition, soon realized that to defeat the splitting tactics of the CP, the SFIO had to abandon its previous weak and defensive line for a determined counter-attack.

The Deeper Reasons for the Communists' Failure

But the electoral victory of the Labor Party and Blum's

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

policies could be effective only because they re-inforced trends which were already latent.

First, there was a decrease of pro-Russian leanings among the lower-middle-classes. An unconditional alliance with Russia lost much of its popularity when the masses began to realize that Russia did not pursue a policy of lasting peace but rather brutal power politics and that an alliance with her could mean one day that France would be involved in a conflict which would not be in accordance with her national interests.

Second, among the workers there developed an opposition against the Communist policy of production at all costs which was clearly in contradiction to their daily interests and demands.

The Communists, more than anybody else, asked the workers to give their utmost in the "battle of production" and stressed the need for sacrifices in the interests of increases in output. "The spirit of sacrifice must now dominate over workingclass demands." Though they didn't completely give up working-class demands, which would have made it impossible for them to retain the obedience of their members, they wanted to defend them only through negotiations between the unions and the government. Said, for example, the Communist deputy Martel, speaking to striking workers in September: "This is the hour of work. Such is now the proper form of fight against an enemy whom we have defeated before through strikes when it was the hour of strikes."

In the realm of production and reconstruction, the CP's submission to Russian interests left it without sufficient room for manoeuvers with regard to working-class demands. Because, the aim of transforming France into a strong advance-position of Russia, made it necessary to accelerate the reconstruction and development of the industrial apparatus. Every aid from the Anglo-Saxon countries necessitated by a too slow reconstruction would necessarily be accompanied by political concessions which would clash with Russian interests. Russia, on the other hand, can give no substantial aid, for obvious reasons.

A New Beginning?

The production policies of the Communists met with strong opposition especially in the mining regions of the North. *L'Espoir*, the Socialist organ of the Northern region, wrote at the end of August: "Shall we, under the pretext of the need for coal, throw ourselves into a crazy adventure? Where will this demagogic course end—a course which may be nothing else than the expression of the incompetence of our union leaders? Shock groups, Stakhanovists, Sunday work, one-hour-overtime per day! Why doesn't Nestor Calonne ask the miners to take their beds down into the pits?"

It was the delegates from those regions which had been most directly affected by this CP policy who, during the August congress of the SFIO, showed themselves the most determined foes of organic unity. And during September, the Northern miners decided to strike against the will of the Communists and of the unions which they dominated. Within the CGT, syndicalist and socialist tendencies, which had been nearly smothered is gaining strength again. Sometimes the CGT leadership is not followed at all when it tries to use the CGT to back up Communist policies. This happened, for example, in the question of the referendum.

Thus the CP obviously has suffered a defeat. But it is not to be expected that, in order to regain the confidence of the workers, it will return to policies of class struggle as certain observers think, who also point to the possible consequences of Gen. de Gaulle's turn in favor of the Western bloc. The Communists might take working-class demands a little more into account. They might use one or the other little maneuver. But their general political line will not change as long as they have not given up hope that France will serve Russian interests in the Third World War. Then, and then only, would they again become defeatists as in 1939. But as yet they still wait for new developments to again bring France to the side of Russia. They live in the spirit of preparation for war and hope that the future victories of the Red Army will bring them into power if they haven't risen to power before. To enhance their attraction for the middle-classes as well as for the working-class, they more than ever stress the nationalistic and chauvinistic note and proclaim that they are the only defenders of the "true interests of France" against "the trusts which have betrayed the fatherland and the governments which followed their orders."

Until now the loss of enthusiasm for the CP on the part of the workers has mainly reinforced the Socialist Party. But this party has no real attraction either for the workers who vote for it nor for those in its own ranks. They vote Socialist or even join the party because the other political tendencies attract them even less, and large layers of workers remain indifferent to both parties. There is without any doubt a certain revival of a-political syndicalist tendencies and small Trotskyist groups. But these groups cannot offer to a new movement what it most needs in order to develop: an understanding of the world of today, which is very different from the world of yesterday.

The recent resistance of the workers against the Communist policies doubtless is more important than the wave of distrust that followed the January speech by Thorez. For the first time since 1936, a part of the working class again acts spontaneously. (During the days of liberation the workers only followed the slogans of authoritarian organizations). But, what is even more important, the workers act in opposition to the Communist leadership, revolting against its policy and the pressure used for its realization. And, contrary to what happened in 1936, the increase in spontaneity does not carry them towards a party that demands acceptance of its authority and imposes this authority, thereby smothering all spontaneity. The workers today revolt not against nationalist and power-political policies, but against their consequences, i. e. against the efforts and additional sacrifices which are demanded from them in order to create an industrial potential to serve not the satisfaction of human needs but military demands. This revolt cannot maintain itself if it is not integrated in a general political program. Such a program would have to attempt to resolve all problems of French society, among them the problems of production and reconstruction, within the framework of a super-national order.

In the face of this situation the theoretical atavism of the French left becomes for the first time a serious obstacle for a possible historic development.

THE MILITARY MIND: DESTRUCTION WITH A SMILE

In their new role as watchdogs of the Pacific, the 13th Air Force daily police an area that stretches from Foochow down the China Coast to Saigon in Indo-China. . . . The flights over China are not considered offensive air action or combat missions, but if fighters or artillery attack, orders are to destroy the attacking planes or ack-ack in a friendly manner. So far, no trouble.

—from an article in a recent issue (Vol. 1, No. 48) of "Outfit", an official Army magazine published especially for hospitalized personnel. (Let me add that this item, sent in by a soldier-reader, seems to me the absolutely perfect "filler"; I shall continue to print these short items, but everything must be an anticlimax after the above. —D.M.)

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

War Trials and German Re-Education

IT is hardly necessary to emphasize the importance of the impending war trials. The guilty will be punished, though it is true that the formal legal basis for the trials is questionable since so far no workable international law exists. From a legal point of view it would be preferable if the war criminals could be tried for their personal participation in individual crimes, according to the laws of the country and by the courts of the country in which the crime was committed. But whatever the legal situation may be, the significance of the trials reaches far beyond the meting out of punishment on individuals, though these individuals happened to succeed in ruling a large part of mankind and in devastating large areas of the world.

It seems that besides punishing of individuals the trials represent an effort to establish international justice. Far too long international law has existed only in theory. Now for the first time an international court will hold accountable the heads of states for acts committed by their governments. For the first time state organizations, such as the Gestapo, will be tried and undoubtedly found guilty. Obviously these functions of the trials are more important than those aspects which will be discussed in this article. The reason for neglecting the more important and for concentrating on the less significant is simple: I do not feel competent to evaluate the significance of the trials as a test case in international law, in the enforcement of international treaties, or as setting a precedent in the accountability of governments. I propose to discuss only the trials' function as a means for re-educating the German people. This aspect of the trials seems quite important because so far, despite elaborate discussion in books and articles, comparatively little seems to have been accomplished in the democratic re-education of Germans.

In planning the trials as a means for re-education, the first problem to be considered is the German's psychological mood at the time they take place. It can be expected that theirs will be a mood of utter weariness, apathy and concentration on the immediate present. All during the time of the Nazi regime the Germans were presented with public performances. They were fed world events instead of food. By now they must be sick and tired of them, particularly if they are not in their favor. If I gauge the German mind correctly, it is tinted with defiance against the victors. About the trials most Germans will think: the victors are running the trials, it is their show, why should we be interested in it.

Thus in order to use the trials for the re-education of the Germans a prime requirement is that the psychological defense of the Germans must be broken down. They must be led to acquire the feeling that the trials are of immediate concern to them, that they are not spectators but participants in them. This feeling probably could quite easily be created if the far reaching intentions of the prosecution would be made clear to them. If I understand correctly, the war criminals will not only be tried as persons but also as representatives of organizations which will be condemned or acquitted at the same time. Many Germans were members of one or the other of the accused organizations, therefore there are probably not many families in Germany without some member who might be punished on the basis of the verdict condemning the organizations to which he used to belong. Realization of this connection between trials and the fate of relatives would go a long way to assure their immediate impact on most Germans.

The problem of whether a people as a whole can be held responsible for war crimes, or crimes against civilization, has been widely discussed. Fortunately it seems that the trials will be based on the sounder principle of individual responsibility. Individual responsibility is a democratic principle with which many Germans are no longer familiar. The state organization to which Germans had lately been accustomed was based on the leader principle. The leader was the only one who carried responsibility. Before and during the trials the Germans must clearly realize that potentially hundreds of thousands, or even millions of them are also accused and tried, namely, for instance, all those who had joined the party before 1933, or all members of the Gestapo. Otherwise, on the basis of the leader principle they will think that only the more prominent Nazis are tried, and hence will think that the trials are only remotely connected with their personal life. If, after the trials are over, individual Germans will be punished on the basis of the trials they will not understand the connection. The trials, instead of having educational value, will then lead only to greater resentment of the victors.

In any case, the situation is, psychologically speaking, very complex, even if we succeed in arousing the Germans' interest in the trials. From the point of view of re-education, the trials should teach the Germans to hate their former leaders, to divorce themselves from the values they stood for, and to be shocked by their crimes. This attitude can not develop if the Germans feel that they are also on trial. If they realize this connection between trial and personal fate, then the prosecutor becomes the comon enemy. It is more likely that they blame rather him than the fellow-accused, if for no other reason because they are forced to identify with the accused leaders, since if the leaders go free, they also are acquitted. If one's fate is closely connected with that of another person, one cannot help trembling and hoping for him. Thus if the Germans realize that they, or their close relatives, are on trial, the trials will reestablish the only recently broken bond between national socialistic leaders and followers. If, on the other hand, the Germans will think that only the war leaders are on trial, they may learn to hate and despise them. But then they will not understand the relation between trials and the subsequent fate of relatives. They will then feel that their punishment is unjust, because during the trials they had learned to hate the leaders and their deeds. Thus they divorced themselves from their own deeds and they will feel betrayed when punished. This feeling will lead to a new identification with the formerly rejected ideology.

In order to fulfill their educational propensities, the trials should find the Germans in the following state of mind: they must neither feel that the trials deal with per-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

sons who are of no concern to them, nor should they be strongly identified with them. We cannot rely on the fact that these persons were the former leaders of Germany for assuring that the attitude of indifference will not prevail. Nothing is more dead than an unsuccessful former leader who is now in distress, nobody is more easily forgotten by his own people than a conquered war leader right after his defeat. Self-preservation alone must lead the Germans to forget how important they thought a Goering or von Papen was to them. They will jump at the possibility to think they were insignificant. The situation might be somewhat different in the case of Hitler, but he will not be on trial.

On the basis of these considerations it seems unlikely that the trials themselves will have the great educational value they ought to have.

BRUNO BETTELHEIM

New Roads in Politics

EDITOR'S NOTE: *For various reasons, it has seemed best to make "New Roads in Politics" a series rather than devote a single issue to it. The object of the series is to criticise the dominant ideology on the left today—which is roughly Marxian—in the light of recent experience, and to suggest and speculate on new approaches to the central problem: how to advance towards a society which shall be humanly satisfying. (At least this is my own notion of the object, which may not necessarily coincide with that of the other contributors to the series.)*

Each author in the series is expressing his own opinions only; the series was "planned" only to the extent that it was announced in the magazine that it would be attempted; the criteria by which the Editor accepted or rejected contributions were those of seriousness and competence, not political tendency. The agreement on certain basic points is thus all the more striking and seems to indicate that a considerable number of leftwing intelletuals in this country feel somewhat the same inadequacies in Marxism and are groping towards somewhat the same kind of alternative.

The opening articles in the series appear herewith. Further articles will appear by Don Calhoun, Nicola Chiaromonte, Helen Constas, Frank Fisher, Dwight Macdonald, James Peck, Albert Votaw and others. It should go without saying that the pages of the magazine will be thrown open to the fullest possible extent to letters of discussion from our readers.

Will Herberg:

Personalism against Totalitarianism

What is there to set against this powerful trend towards the enslavement of the human spirit? I can see nothing except the old religious emphasis upon the individual, which is an essential part of both Christianity and Buddhism—Bertrand Russell.

EVERY historical period has its characteristic problem which sets its mark on all phases of social life and endows all social issues with their measure of relevance. At one time, it was the problem of religious unity; at another, the problem of nationalism; at still another, the "labor" problem. Many of these older problems still persist, of course, but they are no longer central. The central problem of today is the problem of totalitarianism.

1. *Totalitarianism and Collectivism.*

Despite the enormous amount that has been written on the subject, no really adequate analysis of totalitarianism has yet been made, no analysis that does justice alike to its historically new features and to its roots in the past. For our present purposes it is enough to define totalitarianism as a social philosophy that asserts the state to be identical with society and denies autonomy to individuals and non-state social groups. It thus makes a double denial: it denies the autonomous reality of society as against the state and therefore denies all the more the autonomy of the individual as against either society or the state. The two positions are by no means identical. It is possible to vindicate the autonomous reality of society as against the state and yet deny any legitimate autonomy to the individual as against society. Medieval corporatism and modern syndicalist collectivism are examples. On the other hand, it is possible to identify the state with society and yet, in law or in fact, relegate certain spheres of life to the individual. Such was the case with many ancient monarchies and Greek city-states. Totalitarianism of the true modern type requires both the one and the other. It implies the penetration of the state into *every* aspect of human life, the assumption of control over *every* interest, the systematic organization of *every* activity. Despotisms of the past were content with carrying on the business of the state and repressing anti-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

state activities. Totalitarianism proceeds to convert every human interest into a social activity and therefore into a state activity, to be "coordinated" by the state and administered by state agencies. The familiar Italian Fascist definition is still the best: "Everything by and through the state —nothing outside the state."

Totalitarianism is not a political system; it is a spiritual regime, a way of life. It is a spiritual regime in which any claim to personal self-determination, no matter how modest, is rejected as an intolerable presumption, as an abominable blasphemy. No corner of existence is left free and uncontrolled; not so much as a nook or cranny is overlooked. From the cradle to the grave, the subject of the totalitarian state has his life ordered and regulated for him by the higher powers—his work and his play, his education and his leisure, his thoughts and his emotions, his loves and his hates; yes, his religion too, for he cannot call even his soul his own. There is no escape, no refuge, from the stifling omnipresence of the state. There is no privacy.

The practical implementation of this social philosophy through the all-embracing machinery of the totalitarian state became possible only in fairly recent times with the advance of economic integration and the revolutionary developments in the techniques of mass organization, indoctrination and control. Without these techniques and the material equipment upon which they depend it would be manifestly impossible for such states as the German or the Russian to reach into every aspect of life, to control thought and opinion, and to regulate every human interest through a vast network of state-operated fronts and associations.[1] But the philosophy of totalitarianism—its Weltanschauung— is far older and has far deeper roots. It is the final outcome of a spiritual development that has been going on for centuries, since the disintegration of the medieval social order. More immediately, it is the culmination of the upsurge of mass collectivism that is the chief mark of our times.

Under the pluralistic corporatism of the Middle Ages, totalitarianism was of course impossible. The entire political system was built upon decentralization and devolution of authority. The Church insisted on its institutional autonomy and spiritual jurisdiction, the latter of which covered a good deal of ground. Guilds, universities and other associations embodying the social interests of the medieval world likewise enjoyed a considerable measure of autonomy. Thomas Aquinas clearly recognized this pluralism and gave it theoretical sanction in his system of philosophy.

Medieval society, however, allowed little room for individual self-determination. Man was firmly gripped in a hierarchic social order: relations of personal or corporate subordination dominated his life and fixed his status. But there was no approach to totalitarianism. St. Thomas warned specifically against the total absorption of the individual in the community.

It was with the breakup of the medieval order that the first component of modern totalitarianism emerged—the absolute unitary state. The national monarchies of the 16th and 17th centuries strove to concentrate all power in the hands of the prince and to destroy the effectiveness of all social institutions that stood between him and his subjects. The unitary state—that "mortal god", in the adoring formula of Thomas Hobbes, the philosopher of absolutism —was a jealous god.

Equally jealous it was whether it was monarchical or republican in form. Revolutionary and Napoleonic France, as Marx long ago pointed out, completed the work of bureaucratic centralization that the absolute monarchy had begun.

But at this point the absolutism of the state became a popular absolutism and modern mass-democracy emerged. Its prophet was Rousseau, one side of whose contradictory thought was definitely totalitarian. In the chapters of *The Social Contract* dealing with the "general will" and "civic religion," we find one of the earliest expositions of popular absolutism in modern times. The social contract which creates the state involves, so Rousseau tells us, "the total alienation of each associate with all his rights to the community." "The sovereign power, for the simple reason that it is so, is always all that it should be . . . Composed of all, the sovereign can have no interest contrary to any; hence it need give no guarantee to its subjects."[2]

This is the totalitarian doctrine of the omnipotent, absolute and infallible state. Like Hegel after him and the totalitarian theoreticians of today, Rousseau insists that total subjection to the absolute state is true freedom. Since the state is the "general will", the commands it issues to the subject are "really" the law the subject prescribes to himself!

To Hobbes the state had been only a "mortal god" but Rousseau wipes out the distinction. His doctrine of the "civic religion" exhibits some of the most familiar notes of modern totalitarianism: the state is made the center of a cult to which every citizen is obliged to conform, nonconformity incurring banishment and the mere suspicion of insincerity bringing death on grounds of "bad citizenship". In the Jacobin dictatorship with its centralized absolutism resting on the "general will", its state cult, its capital crime of "incivism", etc., we may see the totalitarian aspect of Rousseauism take on flesh and blood and become a potent historical force.

Revolutionary France was the first great mass-democratic state in modern times. It proclaimed the People (politically organized in the state) to be absolute and the voice of the People to be the voice of God. From the very beginning, therefore, modern democracy has been pervaded with a radical ambiguity. On the one hand, it means civil and political liberty, protection of human rights, decisive participation of the "common man" in the selection and control of his rulers. But on the other hand, it has been identified with the mass-state, the deification of the masses as the source of all right and authority, the removal of all barriers to the violence of collective passion and prejudice. According to the former view, the freedom of the individual is the very cornerstone of democracy; according to the latter, it is a blasphemous defiance to the deified People. It is this latter conception that totalitarians have in mind when they speak of their regimes as "true democracies" or "democracies in a higher sense."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Some time during the past century, mass-democracy became explicitly collectivist, thus fulfilling its immanent tendency. In one form or another, the collectivist spirit began permeating all aspects of the social order. Economic life began to lose its individualistic competitive features and to head towards highly integrated monopoly. The state adopted a policy of positive intervention in social and economic life, through direct participation, social legislation or over-all control. Various economic and social interests began to organize collectively, into employers associations, trade unions and the like. Powerful socialist, semi-socialist and quasi-socialist movements emerged. In an epoch when the economic pattern was the paradigm of all social life, the diminishing significance of the individual in economic life inevitably tended to rob him of his importance in the entire scheme of things. He lost his independent worth and significance and became merely an obscure cell in the great collective organism. The triumph of the collectivist spirit during the past century is indeed astonishing although, as so frequently happens in history, it is a triumph that would hardly be recognized as such by its early prophets and pioneers.

Collectivism of the modern type is much more than a form of organization or an economic device. It is a veritable religion, a faith which over large areas has taken the place left vacant by the disintegration of the traditional faiths of our civilization. In this new religion, the community, the collectivity, society or the State is the true divinity, a pantheistic god of which we are all part and through which we achieve our poor measure of reality. Collectivism is thus the "true" way of life, a kind of higher existence transcending individual isolation and selfishness. "Togetherness," absorption of the individual in the group, is the beatific state towards which the new spirituality yearns and strives. In the good society of the future, man will lose all sense of personality and will be absorbed in the group economically, socially and spiritually. His life will be collective life, his thoughts collective thoughts, his feelings and aspirations the feelings and aspirations of the collectivity. In one form or another, this collectivist *mystique* has become the very core of contemporary "social-mindedness" in totalitarian and democratic countries alike.

Belying the ethical insights that gave it birth, socialism has contributed heavily to this development. Converting the collectivist mysticism into an economic, social and political program, it enters the lists as the champion of a brave new world in which "individualism" in all its forms will be eradicated, forgetting that its original indictment of capitalism was that the latter stifled the personality and robbed the masses of all power of individual self-determination. Every measure of collectivization, every measure of collective, even state, control over social and individual life, is hailed as a broadening of "social responsibility." The practical exigencies of socialism as a militant movement operate to strengthen this trend. Close organization and centralized direction, discipline and solidarity, are certainly necessary to a movement fighting for power in the present-day world but no less certainly do they tend to sacrifice the individual on the altar of the collectivity. Thus is the collectivist temper strengthened and "individualism" ("petty bourgeois individualism", if you are a strict Marxist) becomes doubly reprehensible, anti-socialist as well as anti-social.

History has played many a trick in its time but perhaps none more gruesome than when it took over the organizational structure of Continental socialism to serve as the pattern for the totalitarian state. It was the German socialist movement that first began the "politicalization" of everyday life and the "coordination" of the social activities of the masses. A vast network of special organizations —socialist fronts—was carefully built up, beginning with trade unions and cooperatives and going all the way down to Socialist Sunday Schools for children, all part of the "movement" and all controlled by the party, though not always very effectively. No social interest was ignored, no corner of life overlooked. If a man, woman or child liked to play chess, to put on amateur theatricals, to go on hikes or to take snapshots, he was to do it together with like-minded comrades in a socialist organization. There was a socialist club or league for everything.

This system of total organization was taken over and immensely perfected by the communists[3] and fascists. It is not difficult to see how with the seizure of power by either of these totalitarian groups, with the party becoming the state, the network of party organizations can be converted into a far-flung state apparatus of mass organization and control so characteristic of totalitarianism. The old socialist appeal "Everything in and through the movement" becomes the formula of totalitarianism once the "movement" becomes the state. In Russia, because of the special historical conditions under which totalitarianism emerged, the fusion of party and state was completed only after some years. In Germany, however, it accompanied the birth of the National-Socialist regime. In both cases the marks of the old Continental socialist system of total organization are plainly to be seen.

Although it would seem to be hardly necessary, perhaps I had better state explicitly at this point that the processes I have been describing whereby socialism helped to pre-

PACIFICA VIEWS

A Journal of Pacifist Opinion

Recently, the editor of *Politics* wrote to the editors of *Pacifica Views:*

"*PV* has become one of my favorite periodicals. You print a lot of real thinking — by 'real' I mean not repeating formulae or making literary gestures, but trying to see how a general theory or position applies to the world about us."

Contributors and editors represent primarily the younger generation of politically and socially conscious American pacifists. Size, small; presentations, terse.

Write for sample copies.

Published weekly, 2617 Pine St., San Francisco 15, California: Price, $2.00 per year.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

pare the way for totalitarianism were altogether unconscious. It was the objective logic of obsessive collectivism and engulfing organization that brought socialism to this desperate plight. That socialism itself should have nourished the demonic spirit whose first victim it became is one of the tragic ironies of the history of our time.

II. Personalism and Socialism

Totalitarianism cannot be met either on the theoretical or the practical level merely by opposing isolated aspects and manifestations; it must be fought in the name of a radically opposed principle—and that principle is personalism.

Personalism[4] affirms the primacy of the person both existentially and morally. It ascribes independent reality and ultimate value to the individual person alone. Persons alone are ends-in-themselves; all else—social institutions, society, the state—have being and significance derivatively, only as means.

"The entire world," writes Berdyaev[5], "is nothing in comparison with human personality, with the unique person of man, with his unique fate. Man, human personality, is the supreme value, not the community, not collective realities . . . such as society, nation, state, civilization, church. This is the personalist scale of values."

Jacques Maritain proclaims the same principle[6]: "The human person transcends all temporal societies and is superior to them[7]."

To the personalist, society is not an organism with a reality of its own on a par with, if not superior to, that of individual persons. Society is essentially a functional organization and the state a mere social agency, one among many. "Society is not an organism", Berdyaev writes. "It is not a being or a personality. The reality of society consists in the personalities themselves . . . Man is the organism and society his organ, not the other way about."

Marx and Thomas Aquinas both reject the organismic theory, although with somewhat different emphasis. Marx says:[8] "One must always avoid setting up 'society' as an abstraction opposed to the individual. The individual is the social entity. His life is therefore an expression and verification of the life of society."

St. Thomas, according to Hans Meyer[9], "found it necessary to say that the community is not a metaphysical entity as is a physical organism; it is only a working entity."

What personalism fundamentally opposes is *depersonalization*—the degradation of the person into a thing, into a mere instrumentality or means. This is slavery. Freedom is the preservation of personality as autonomous subject and end. Marx saw this clearly when he denounced bourgeois society because it led to the *Verdinglichung* of men.

It is on such grounds that personalists advocate socialism. Personalist socialism opposes the capitalist order not because of its "excessive" individualism but because, for all its lip-service to individualism, it degrades and stultifies the individual personality—because it enslaves man by turning him into a thing, an instrument, a mere depersonalized adjunct of the machine. Personalist socialism calls for a transformation of the economic order so as to liberate man and permit him to develop to the full the powers and capacities of his personality. Economic collectivism it regards as necessary only in order to provide the basis for freedom and genuine personality under modern industrial conditions.

Socialist reform, says Berdyaev, is to be justified "not on the rights of the state in economic life but on the supremacy of the individual economic right, on the guarantee of those individual rights. This is the emancipation of the individual man, of human personality, by means of the abolition of economic privileges. The state has the duty to guarantee the free development of the autonomous life."

Marx justified socialism on exactly the same grounds: "The worker is free only when he is the owner of his own instruments of labor. This ownership can assume either the individual or the collective form. Since individual ownership is being abolished from day to day through economic development, there remains only the form of collective ownership"[10] . . .

In this sense Berdyaev distinguishes "two types of socialism, the servile and the free." The former "may be 'left', and this is communism, or it may be 'right', and this is national-socialism." In either case, it is totalitarian; it exalts and deifies the collectivity and denies the autonomy of the individual person. "Free socialism," personalist socialism, on the other hand, aims at the liberation and enhancement of the personality according to the early-Marxian formula: "the free development of each will lead to the free development of all."

Under present-day conditions, the fundamental problem is to gain ascendancy over the sweeping collectivist current and direct it into democratic channels. Economic life is becoming daily more collectivized, daily more subject to social control and state regulation. The alternative confronting mankind is no longer between "free" capitalism and socialist collectivism; collectivism in some form is here and is here to stay. The alternative that now confronts mankind is between *totalitarian* collectivism and *democratic* collectivism. It is true that economic collectivism in its very nature generates a powerful totalitarian potential. But democratic collectivism is possible provided that the great guiding principle is undeviatingly adhered to that freedom is the aim, the goal, the supreme value, while collectivism is, in the economic sphere, the means whereby that end may best be achieved.

Failure to grasp the nature of the alternative confronting mankind today may lead to very serious confusion in judgment and perspective. Thus we often hear the argument that runs as follows: "With all its shortcomings the 'Russian experiment' has rendered one service of incalculable value to socialism and democracy, and that service is to disprove the alleged necessity of private capitalism and to establish the possibility and practicability of a collective economy." This line of argument, even if we grant its contention about what Russia proves, reveals a complete misunderstanding of the crucial problem of our time.

There is no need today for anyone to prove that private capitalism can be dispensed with and replaced by some sort of collective economy. That is happening before our very

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

eyes and has been going on for decades. The course of development towards a collective economy of some sort is as clear in the United States and Great Britain as it is in Russia or Germany.

The real problem, as I have suggested, is of a very different order; not is a collective economy possible but is a *democratic* collective economy possible? Here Soviet Russia, insofar as it teaches any lesson at all, teaches a lesson that tends to discredit the possibility of a democratic collectivism and to persuade the general mass of men who give any thought to the question that a collectivist economy must necessarily be bureaucratic, totalitarian and dictatorial.

In other words, what the "Russian experiment" has done is to identify collectivism as such with dictatorship and totalitarianism, and Nazi Germany (with its different brand of collectivism) has reinforced the argument. This can hardly be regarded as service to socialism and democracy; on the contrary, it is the gravest sort of disservice.

Today the problem is to show how it is possible to reconcile an economic system more or less collectivist with democracy and individual freedom. Among recent writers to tackle this problem Lewis Corey seems most satisfactory. His book, *The Unfinished Task* (1942), lays bare the totalitarian forces that thoroughgoing collectivism generates and outlines with care the foundations of a modified collectivism that can really be democratic. A pluralistic economy, avoiding the concentration of economic power in the hands of the state by distributing it among a variety of public and quasi-public institutions and even, as in agriculture and small business, among private enterprisers, is his conception. A new system of checks and balances, based on the effective power of autonomous non-state associations such as trade unions and cooperatives, is another aspect of his program.[11]

Berdyaev, from a totally different point of departure, reaches the same conclusion as Corey. He urges "a pluralistic economy, that is to say, a combination of nationalized economics, socialized economics and personal economics, insofar as it does not admit capitalism and exploitation . . . Only decentralization can ward off the danger of the development of bureaucracy."

I hardly think it needs any explicit statement to indicate that personalist socialism, while accepting economic collectivism to the degree necessary to provide a groundwork for freedom under modern conditions, is unalterably opposed to the extension of the collectivist spirit to other levels.

"Only economics can be socialized," Berdyaev warns. "The spiritual life cannot, nor can the consciousness and conscience of man. The socialization of economics ought to be accompanied by the individualization of men and women."

That precisely was the ideal of the pioneers of libertarian socialism. Social organization must mean not the total submergence of the individual in the mass but a better chance for the full and free development of the individual personality. Socialism must lead to a higher and more complete individualism.

III. Spiritual Foundations

At its deepest level the conflict between personalism and totalitarianism is a religious conflict for both are at bottom religious faiths grounded in beliefs that go beyond experience or rational proof. In our civilization, true reverence for personality emerged with Christianity, as the quotation from Russell[12] used as the epigraph of this article suggests. Rousseau was certainly right in charging Christianity with undermining the "unity" of the state. In antiquity, he points out, each people had its own gods and its religion was an aspect of its collective existence: "They did not distinguish their religion from their laws." Christianity destroyed this identity of religion and society by establishing a spiritual kingdom transcending all earthly societies and beyond their jurisdiction. This Christian spirit of autonomy Rousseau condemns as civically pernicious; we see in it the surest foundation of human freedom.

Nowhere in classical antiquity do we find an adequate recognition either of the individual's status as an autonomous personality or of the inherent limitations of the power of the state over society and of both state and society over the individual. State and society were distinguished hardly if at all, and all human life was of right presumed to be subject to social control. Realistic philosophers, such as Aristotle, might concede that in fact there must be some bounds to such control, while insisting in principle, as categorically as Plato, that no one must suppose he belonged to himself since all alike belonged to the state. Neither Judaism nor Christianity could tolerate this totalitarian view since both insisted that man belonged primarily to God, who is the god not merely of this or that society but of the entire universe. Unconditional subjection to a universal and transcendent god precludes the possibility of total and absolute subjection to any earthly power, social or political. Earthly powers claiming such absolute jurisdiction appear as usurpers and pretenders to the prerogatives of deity: "Give unto Caesar that which is Caesar's and to God that which is God's." In this injunction we have the ultimate challenge to totalitarianism, which denies that there is anything which is not Caesar's.

True understanding of the value and significance of human personality emerged with Prophetic insistence on individual moral responsibility and reached its full expression in Christian spirituality. "Ideal religion," as Niebuhr points out,[13] "makes reverence for personality the end of human action."

"The recognition of the absolute value of every personality," writes Berdyaev, "as made in the image and likeness of God, the inadmissibility of treating the human personality as a mere instrument or tool, lies at the very basis of Christianity. It is precisely Christianity which teaches that the human soul is of more value than all the kingdoms of the world . . . A man may, and frequently ought to, sacrifice his life but not his personality; the personality within him he ought to realize, and sacrifice is the condition for realizing personality."

It is directly from Judaism and Christianity that modern secular humanitarianism and ethical philosophy derive their emphasis on personality: Locke's denial that we are "made for one another's uses as the inferior creatures are made for us"; Kant's precept of every human being as an end in himself; Marx's protest against the *Verdinglichung* of men in bourgeois society.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

From the Judaeo-Christian standpoint, totalitarian religion in whatever form is a monstrous idolatry, for it exalts the collectivity, "the work of man's hands," into a god for his worship. Between the two the conflict is irreconcilable; no genuine compromise is possible even though the Christian Church, blinded by the secular interests in which it, as a social institution, is inextricably involved, has only too often played the game of the devil.

The social drive which secular humanitarianism once received from its Christian sources has long given out. Nor can sociological positivism any longer satisfy with its shallow formulas and plausible half-truths. Socialism—mankind—needs something at once more profound and more dynamic. Fundamentally, only the personalist *mystique* of vital religion can supply the spiritual resources to resist totalitarian diabolism.

NOTES

1. Widespread literacy is one of the conditions favoring the totalitarian "coordination" of the mind. See Sidney Hook's suggestive article, "The Degradation of the Word," in the *New Leader*, January 27, 1945.
2. The quotations from Rousseau are from *The Social Contract*, Book I, chaps. VI, VII; Book IV, chap. VIII.
3. Before long the communists also developed a system of crypto-communist (or "popular") fronts as a mechanism for reaching, influencing and manipulating non-communist elements without their knowledge.
4. Person, individual, individual personality, etc., are here employed synonymously although Maritain and other Catholic personalists make an important metaphysical distinction between person and individual.
5. The quotations from Berdyaev are all from Nicolas Berdyaev, *Slavery and Freedom*, except the last, which is from *The Origins of Russian Communism*.
6. *The Rights of Man*, p. 13.
7. To which might be added that even the Church, as a social institution at least, is a temporal society.
8. *Oekonomische-philosophische Manuskripte*, p. 177.
9. *The Philosophy of St. Thomas Aquinas*, p. 446.
10. This is Marx's preamble to the French socialist program as summarized by Engels. See Ed. Bernstein, *Die Briefe von Engels an Bernstein*, letter of Oct. 25, 1881.
11. Bronislaw Malinowski, in his posthumous work, *Freedom and Civilization*, links the autonomy of institutions with the essence of democracy: "This autonomy of institutions really contains and embodies all other principles of democracy. This functional autonomy is realized in the independence of institutions and makes possible the organization and combination of groups where cooperation is necessary and interests divergent."
12. *The Philosophy of Bertrand Russell*, edited by P. A. Schilpp, p. 733.
13. *Does Civilization Need Religion*, p. 79.

BLIND-LEADING-THE-BLIND DEPT.

Since my approval as education director by the Board, there are many changes and recommendations I would like to bring about through the Board's help, cooperation and approval. I most firmly believe that a good education program can only be made a reality through your help and constructive criticisms along with you and your staff being fully aware at all times of our program.

—Beginning of report by Jack Zeller, newly appointed Education Director of the United Automobile Workers, as printed in "The United Auto Worker" for Oct. 1.

THE ATOM BOMB: A NEW ANGLE

P. S. With the atom bomb in the power of Protestant democratic countries, the efforts of Catholicism to win America will be redoubled. This increased threat means that we must now, more than ever before, intensify our vigilance.

—conclusion of a circular dated September 10, from "The Converted Catholic Magazine."

DEPARTMENT OF CONSTRUCTIVISM

Hanson W. Baldwin, military editor of "The N. Y. Times", has signed a contract with Harpers for a history of World War II. Constructive criticism and analyses will be stressed in Mr. Baldwin's history.

—"N. Y. Times", November 6, 1945.

Towards a Socialist Program

THE Editor writes in the August issue: "We must 'get' the modern National State before it 'gets' us".

I think this is indeed the question.

Along this line, too, is the conclusion of Victor Serge's letter in the same issue: "Contemporary socialism should frankly recognize *its past mistakes* in this field and should put itself forward as the *uncompromising* defender of human life and human rights".

But we must have no illusions about the effort we must exert against our own natures if we would rid ourselves of the usual way—assumed to be the only way—of looking at the political and economic organization of modern society, and also of conceiving of that entity which is *the nation* (an entity that is "social" according to Gurvitch, spiritual according to Mazzini and Renan, linked with "popular sovereignty" according to the Jacobins, taken as a natural division of mankind by Marxism). Let us not deceive ourselves. The attitude that seemed so natural to Montesquieu ("I am French by chance, but a man by necessity") is most difficult to realize in practice today, after the French Revolution, romanticism, the national unifications of the 19th century, and the famous right of peoples to self-determination.

Jean Malaquais' execution of the wretched Aragon was very good. But what can we do about the "honest bundle of sentiments" of the patriotic Moldavian or Batavian? Or the patriotism of Leon Blum, or that of the editors of *Combat*, who are also fascinated by "wide human horizons"?

Robert Anders criticizes Beveridge's economic proposals with great clarity, and yet what he himself would substitute for Beveridgism is a socialist economic plan which seems to respect *national* lines.

I vote with both hands for Dwight Macdonald's demonstration of the totalitarian nature of much modern liberal thinking. And yet the problem remains: If the six million Swedes form a geographical and political "organism", and if the 160 million Russians form another such compact and united "organism", how to guarantee the secure existence of the weak Sweden next door to mighty Russia—short of a universal moral conversion, or of the enforcement of a system of international police (in which case, *Quis Custodiet Custodes?*)

The idea that "the workers have no fatherland", like the older concept of the "citizen of the world", seems either antiquated or else of so abstract a nature as to be inapplicable to our everyday experience.

Religious movements—compacts of emotion, fraternity and spiritual culture—have hardened into Churches (the Egyptian hierarchy, Brahmanism, Islam, Roman Catholicism, and other established Churches). They represented an amalgam of moral teachings, an apparatus of coercion, and economic power. We know well what this has meant in terms of the subjugation of man, the perversion of culture, and the profanation of religious feeling itself.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Greece never knew such forms of dogmatism, submitting the soul and the body to the same police control. Hence it was the revival of Greek thought that helped Western man to revolt against ecclesiastical tyranny. We have succeeded, although very incompletely, in curbing the Churches by forcing them to accept the status of private associations, by curtailing their riches, by taking away from them the support of the "secular arm". But for religious idols, other idols have been substituted, not less nefarious.

Many modern historians—not only German—have reproached the Hellenes because of their obdurate opposition to the unified national State which Philip of Macedonia and his successors, and Titus Flamininus after them, so generously wanted to impose on Hellas. Still a Greek was fully and proudly conscious of his native tongue, of his culture, of his ethnic characteristics. But a Greek would never have understood what we Europeans have accepted as a perfectly natural fact since the 16th century: that a man could alienate his humanity for the greater glory and splendor of his "ethnicity".

Modern despotism in its successive stages—Louis XIV, Frederick William I, the Committee of Public Safety and Napoleon, Bismarck, Hitler and Stalin—is based on an amalgam similar to that on which theocracy rests. The moral and intellectual values of the *nation* seem unable to exist if not founded on the monopoly of a territory, which in its turn requires an increasingly strong State and an economic organisation. From mercantilism to "socialism in one country", this economic organisation has always shown a definite tendency toward "autarchy", while, on the other hand, the opposite tendency, economic expansion culminating in imperialism, is just as nationalistic, "fair play" being proposed only insofar as one is perfectly assured that he is the stronger.

This is the bundle (the *fasces* . . .) that has to be undone, if we mean what we say when we affirm that we do not want man to be devoured by the National State. The problem appears to be how to dissociate the nation from the government of the territory, and this from the organisation of economic life.

It seems evident that the more differentiated the systems of relations between men and groups, the more concretely is freedom guaranteed in human society. There is, however, one condition: that any bond between the individual and a group be voluntarily constituted and easily rescinded.

If the nation, conceived as the community of people speaking and "cultivating" the same language and united by common memories, could become a private association deprived of any power to force people to join it or prevent them from leaving it, the real "national values" would not fare any worse than true religious values in a really "free" Church.

Modern technology requires more than ever that the circulation of commodities, of men, of ideas, take place without any hindrance. It should be a fundamental article of the law of nations that no authority—be it local, national or international—has the power (except in a few well defined cases such as that of sanitary quarantine) to prevent the passage of any person to any point on earth. The government of the territory (subdivided into small autonomous units) should be entrusted to all the adults who have been residing on it, let's say for the last three years, without any consideration for the country in which they were born, their language, their race, etc.

After which, the most difficult problem would remain: the organization of economic life. Economic life is inconceivable today except on a world scale. The danger would be great, if an enormous economic power were to be concentrated in a few directing centers. On the other hand, there seems to be no question as to the inadvisability of entrusting either the States or a coalition of them (into some kind of League of Nations) with the direction of world-economy. Again, we should take into consideration a plurality of associations deprived of any power of coercion, except for the unavoidable pressure of massive majorities and of purely economic power. Railroads, mining centers, and other essential economic structures, should be organized into large boards where 1) the technicians; 2) the Council of workers; 3) the representatives of the consumers, would cooperate (or come into conflict) in the management of the respective concerns. There should be a world federation of the labor unions; and cooperatives should also have a world organization.

The "federal principle" should be the basic principle of all these organizations, with a maximum of autonomy at the bottom and a minimum of unrestricted power at the top. In such a way, the freedom of the individual would be protected as much as it is humanly possible. And we should never forget that freedom cannot exist without some disorder. *A free man creates disorder.* There is no "pre-established harmony" between the maximum of human freedom and the highest efficiency of an economic or juridical organization. If we think of economic activity in terms of sheer efficiency, then, of course, we cannot have freedom.

In terms of the present wretched conditions, all this is Utopia, of course. The real question, however, seems to be if from a socialist, humanistic, and rational, point of view it is possible to think according to lines essentially different from these. I would be contradicting some of my firmest convictions if I implied in any way that I am thinking of some kind of "ideal constitution" into which the human cattle should be penned by physical violence, or by the not less brutal means of demagogical arguments. Problems, conflicts, the tragedies caused by misunderstanding and *Hubris* will go on as long as there will be men. The question is not how to eliminate sorrow and conflict from human life, but, for each one of us, in what direction to think and to strive.

Socialism, the search for Justice as well as for human happiness, cannot be satisfied anymore with the Marxian notions of 1) class struggle inside each nation; 2) seizure of State power in order first to utilize it and then to scrap it. The most peaceful civilian is nowadays exposed to dangers that are probably greater than those faced by the soldier in battle. Hence the immediate and resolute attitude of each and every person is today far more important than any question of political strategy. We must do everything we can to bring about the disintegration of the compact State-territory-Nation.

Politics has been right in paying much attention to the conscientious objectors. One of its correspondents has said

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of the Germans (how accurately I could not tell, but it seems significant in any case): "it was the most intelligent thing that the Germans could do, lacking, as they did, the physical power to overthrow Hitler, but being able to force him to suicide by becoming *a nation of Gandhis . . .*". On the other hand, it is reasonably sure that the Italian people brought about Mussolini's downfall with their refusal to cooperate with him.

Would it be far-fetched to consider conscientious objection, passive resistance, refusal to obey and to cooperate as new forms, however intensified and charged with a greater potential of individual responsibility, of that old method of struggle, which the proletariat discovered instinctively and which brought them so many essential conquests: the *strike?*

It is to give a clear direction to such an effort, whose signs are still rather dim and confused, that every socialist and every group of socialists should work, by developing some fundamental principles to be followed consistently in private life as well as in all public manifestations.

We should come to an agreement on the radical refusal to submit to the idolatrous trinity "Nation-Fatherland-State".

The International, conceived as a compound of nations, has been proved illusory. A new International should be based on the radical negation of the Nation insofar as it is an organism armed with means of compulsion.

Since 1789, the Nation has become a divinity. We must desecrate it.

As for the State, once it is deprived of the national sacrament, it becomes a machinery, and nothing else. As such, the only proper answer to its unbearable claims is sabotage.

But our third principle should be: final, irrevocable renunciation of any form of organized violence.

EUROPEAN

Paul Goodman

Revolution, Sociolatry and War

1. A Miscalculation in the Marxian Dynamics of Revolution

ACCORDING to Marx and Engels, the dynamism of the people's revolution into socialism rises from the interaction of two psychological attitudes: (a) the spiritual alienation of the proletariat, because of extreme division of labor and capitalist productive relations, from man's original concern with production and from natural social cooperation; (b) the brute reaction to intolerable deprivation brought on by the falling rate of profit and the capitalist crises. To expand these points somewhat:

(a) To Marx and Engels the specific properties of humanity are the ability to produce things and to give mutual aid in production. But the sub-division of labor and the capitalist use of machine technology de-humanize production: a man makes only a part of a commodity sold on a distant market; and, performing an automatic operation, he employs only a modicum of his powers. Further, the conditions of bourgeois competition and wage-slavery isolate men from each other and destroy mutuality, family-life, comradeship. There is therefore nothing in the capitalist institutions to engage the deep interest or keep the loyalty of the proletariat. They are made into fractional people and these fractions of men are indifferent to the bourgeois mores and society.

(b) On the other hand they are not indifferent to starvation, disease, sexual deprivation, infant mortality, and death in war; but these are the results of the wage-cuts, imperialism, unemployment and fluctuation inherent in the bourgeois need to counteract the falling rate of profit and to reinvest. At the level of resentment at frustration and animal reaction to pain, there is concern for a violent change, there is latent rebellion.

From these attitudes, the revolutionary idea emerges somewhat as follows: Driven by need to consult their safety, and with understanding given by teachers who explain the causes of their hurt, and with their original human aspirations recalled from forgetfulness and already fulfilled somewhat by comradely unity, the proletariat turns toward a new order, new foundations, a socialism immeasurably improved, and yet in its main features not unlike original human nature. By contrast to this idea, the life of the bourgeoisie itself seems worthless. And being increased in numbers and with their hands on the productive machinery of all society, the proletarians know that they can make the idea a reality.

Psychologically—and even anthropologically and ethically—this Marxian formula has great power, if indeed all of its elements exist as prescribed. But, on the contrary, if any of the elements is missing the formula is disastrous and takes us as far from fraternal socialism as can be. Now there is no question that point (b) is missing: that by and large over the last century in the advanced industrial countries the real wages of the working class as a whole have not lingered at the margin of *physical* subsistence and reproduction*; they have advanced to a point where even revolutionary writers agitate for a "sociological standard of living" and cry out against "one-third of a nation" being ill-fed and ill-housed. (The reasons, of course, are the astounding increase in productivity, the need for domestic markets, and such gross profits that the rate of profit has lost paramount importance.) What has been the result?

The spiritual alienation of point (a) has gone even further, I suppose, than Marx envisaged. He followed the

*The argument is meant to apply especially to the United States, where the increase in real wages has been due not preponderantly to overseas exploitation, but to increased productivity.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

de-humanization of production to the last subdivision of labor into an automatic gesture, but I doubt whether he (being sane) could have foreseen that thousands of adult persons could work day in and day out and not know what they were making, as was the case in the atomic-bomb plants. He did not foresee the de-humanization of consumption in the universal domestic use of stream-lined conveniences whose operation the consumer does not begin to understand; the destruction of even the free choices in the marketplace by mass-advertising and monopolistic controls; the segregation among experts in hospitals of all primary experience of birth, pain, and death, etc., etc.

Yet it is not the case that these fractional persons, alienated from their natures, are brought sharply to look out for themselves by intolerable deprivation. On the contrary, they are even tricked, by the increase in commodities, into finding an imitation satisfaction in their "standard of living"; and the kind of psychological drive that moves them is—emulation! The demand of the organized proletariat for a living-wage and tolerable working-conditions, a demand that in the beginning was necessarily political and revolutionary in its consequences, now becomes a demand for a standard of living and for leisure to enjoy the goods, *accepting the mores of the dominant class.* (What are we to say of "leisure" as a good for an animal whose specific humanity is to be productive?) Then if these persons have gone over to the ideals of another class, it is foolish to call them any longer "proletarians" ("producers of offspring", as Marx nobly and bitterly characterized the workers); but given the apparently satisfied alienation from concern in production—and where do we see anything else?—it is also unjust to call them workers.

Marx saw wonderfully the emptiness of life in the modern system; but he failed to utter the warning that this emptiness could proceed so far that, without the spur of starvation, it could make a man satisfied to be a traitor to his original nature. What he relied on to be a dynamic motor of revolution has become the cause of treason.

Lastly, the scientific teachers of the masses are no longer concerned to recall us to our original creative natures, to destroy the inhuman subdivision of labor, to look to the bands of comrades for the initiation of direct action. On the contrary, their interest has become the health and smooth functioning of the industrial machine itself: they are economists of full employment, psychologists of vocational guidance, and politicians of administrative bureaux.

So far the psychology of the masses. But in the psychology of the bourgeoisie there is a correlated difference from what Marx envisaged. The Marxian bourgeois has the following characteristics: (a) Pre-occupied with exchange-value, with money which is featureless, he is alienated from all natural personal or social interests; this makes all the easier his ruthless career of accumulation, reinvestment, exploitation, and war. (b) On the other hand, he embodies a fierce lust, real even tho manic, for wealth and power. The conditions of his role are given by the

Announcing:

The Forthcoming Publication of

ART AND SOCIAL NATURE

by

Paul Goodman

With Essays On:

Reflections on Drawing the Line
On Treason Against Natural Societies
A Touchstone for the Libertarian Program
Natural Violence
Revolution, Sociolatry, and War
Unanimity
Western Tradition and World Concern
The Meaning of Abstraction in Literature
The Shape of the Screen and the Darkness of the Theatre
Literary Method and Author-Attitude

Mail Orders Now Accepted

VINCO PUBLISHING COMPANY 500 East 161st St., New York 56, N. Y.

Price $3.00

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

economy, but he plays the role with all his heart; he is an individual, if not quite a man. The spur of a falling rate of profit or of closed markets, therefore, drives him on to desperate adventures.

By and large I do not think that this type is now very evident. Partly, to be sure, it is that the owning classes adopt a democratic camouflage for their protection; but the fact that they are willing to do this already shows that they are different men. Other factors seem to me important: (1) In absentee-ownership there is an emasculation of the drive for maximum exploitation of the labor and the machine; the owner does not have the inspiration of his daily supervision; he is not approached by inventors and foremen, etc.; but the salaried manager is usually concerned with stability rather than change. (2) But even if the drive to improve the exploitation is strong, the individual capitalist is disheartened by the corporate structure in which most vast enterprises are now imbedded; he is embarrassed by prudent or timid confrères. (Government regulation is the last stage of this corporative timidity.) (3) Not least, it now seems that even in peace-time there is a limit to the falling rate of profit; technical improvement alone guarantees an annual increment of more than 2%; by deficit spending the state can subsidize a low but stable rate of profit on all investment; there is apparently no limit to the amount of nonsense that people can be made to want to buy on the instalment plan, mortgaging their future labor. And in fact we see, to our astonishment, that a large proportion, almost a majority, of the bourgeoisie are even now ready to settle for plans that guarantee a low but stable profit. Shall we continue to call them bourgeois? They are rentiers.

The more dynamic wolf, on the other hand, is no longer a private enterpriser, but increasingly becomes a manager and administrator of the industrial machine as a whole: he is in the Government. He bares his teeth abroad.

2. Sociolatry

With the conclusions so far reached, we can attempt a formal definition of the mass-attitude that we call *Sociolatry* (after Comte):

Sociolatry is the concern felt by the masses alienated from their deep natures for the smooth functioning of the industrial machine from which they believe they can get a higher standard of living.

The revolutionary tension of the people is absorbed and sublimated by the interesting standard of living; but this standard is not physiological (which would be potentially revolutionary) nor is it principally economic, a standard of comfort and luxury (which would slow down the machine by breeding idleness, dilettantism, and eccentricity); it is a sociological standard energized by emulation and advertising, and cementing a sense of unanimity among the alienated. All men have—not the same human nature—but the same commodities. Thus, barring war, such an attitude of alienated concern could have a long duration. I say "barring war"—but we must ask below whether the war is not essentially related to the attitude.

On the part of the political élite: sociolatry is the agreement of the majority of the bourgeoisie to become rentiers of the industrial corporation in whose working they do not interfere; and the promotion of the more dynamic bourgeoisie to high-salaried, prestigious, and powerful places at the controls of the machine. Sociolatry is therefore the psychology of state-capitalism and state-socialism.

3. What Must be the Revolutionary Program

Still barring from consideration the threat of war, we must now ask: what is a revolutionary program in the sociolatry? (By "revolutionary" I here refer to the heirs of Rousseau and the French Revolution: the conviction that man is born free and is in institutional chains, that fraternity is the deepest political force and the fountain of social invention; and that socialism implies the absence of state or other coercive power.)

For if indeed, with the steady expansion of technical productivity, the attitude of the masses has for a century moved toward sociolatry and the attitude of the bourgeoisie toward accepting a low but stable rate of profit, then the Marxian program is not only bankrupt but reactionary. The Marxian economic demands (for wages and conditions) cement the sociolatry; the Marxian political demands (for expropriation of the expropriators by seizing power) lead to state-socialism.

It is with diffidence and sadness that I here openly dissent from statements of Karl Marx. When I was young, being possessed of an independent spirit I refused to embrace the social science of Marx, but proceeded, as an artist and a human-being, to make my own judgments of the social behavior I saw about. And then I found, again and again, that the conclusions I slowly and imperfectly arrived at were already fully and demonstrably (and I may say, beautifully) expressed by Karl Marx. So I too was a Marxist! I decided with pleasure, for it is excellent to belong to a tradition and have wise friends. This has to do with Marx as a social psychologist. As regards political action, on the other hand, I do not see, it has not seemed to me, that the slogans of the Marxians, nor even of Marx, lead toward fraternal socialism; rather they lead away from it.

Now (*still* barring the war!) there is a great advantage for the revolutionist in the existence of sociolatry and of even a tyrannical state-socialism. The "standard of living" and the present use of the machinery of production may rouse our disgust, but it is an ethical disgust; it is not the fierce need to act roused by general biological misery.* We may therefore act in a more piecemeal, educational, and thorogoing way. The results of such action will also be lasting and worthwhile if we have grown into our freedom rather than driven each other into it. Our attack on the industrial system can be many-sided and often indirect, to make it crash of its own weight rather than by frontal attack. ("One of the Evil One's most effectual arts of seduction," says Kafka, "is the challenge to battle. It is like the fight with woman, that ends in bed.")

Nor is it the case that the absence of tension and despair makes it impossible to awaken revolutionary feeling. For we know that the society we want is universally present in the heart, tho now generally submerged: it can be brought

* Since I wrote this, the foreign scene has already again become such that we weep with dismay and disgust. Can one's reaction be ethical?

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

into existence piecemeal, power by power, everywhere: and as soon as it appears in act, the sociolatry becomes worthless, ridiculous, disgusting by comparison. There is no doubt that, once awakened, the natural powers of men are immeasurably stronger than those alien institutions (which are indeed only the pale sublimations of natural powers).

On the one hand, the kind of critique that my friends and I express: a selective attitude toward the technology, not without peasant features, is itself a product of our surplus technology; on the other hand, we touch precisely the vulnerable point of the system.

Then, as opposed to the radical programs that already pre-suppose the great state and corporative structure, and the present social institutions in the perfected form of the Sociolatry, we must—in small groups—draw the line and at once begin action directly satisfactory to our deep nature. (a) It is essential that our program can, with courage and mutual encouragement and mutual aid, be put into effect by our own effort, to a degree at once and progressively more and more, without recourse to distant party or union decisions. (b) The groups must be small, because mutual aid is our common human nature mainly with respect to those with whom we deal face to face. (c) Our action must be aimed not, as utopians, at a future establishment; but (as millenarians, so to speak) at fraternal arrangements today, progressively incorporating more and more of the social functions into our free society.

1. It is treasonable to free society not to work at a job that realizes our human powers and transcends the inhuman subdivision of labor. It is a matter of guilt—this is a hard saying—to exhaust your time of day in the usual work in offices and factories, merely for wages. The aim of economy is not the efficient production of commodities, but cooperative jobs themselves worth doing, with the workers' full understanding of the machines and processes, releasing the industrial inventiveness that is in each man. (Nor is it the case, *if we have regard to the whole output of social labor*, that modern technical efficiency requires, or is indeed compatible with, the huge present concentrations of machinery beyond the understanding and control of small groups of workers.*)

2. We must re-assess our standard of living and see what parts are really useful for subsistence and humane well-being, and which are slavery to the emulation, emotional security, and inferiority roused by exploitative institutions and coercive advertising. The question is not one of the quantity of goods (the fact that we swamp ourselves with household furnishings is likely due to psychic causes too deep for us to alter), but that the goods that make up the "standard of living" are stamped with alien values.

3. We must allow, and encourage, the sexual satisfaction of the young, both adolescents and small children, in order to free them from anxious submissiveness to authority. It is probably impossible to prevent our own neurotic prejudices from influencing small children, but we can at least make opportunity for the sexual gratification of adolescents. This is essential in order to prevent the patterns of coercion and authority from reemerging no matter what the political change has been.

*This point is argued at length in the forthcoming *Communitas* by Percival and Paul Goodman, Univ. of Chicago Press, 1946.

4. In small groups we must exercise direct political initiative in community problems of personal concern to ourselves (housing, community-plan, education, etc.) The constructive decisions of intimate concern to us cannot be delegated to representative government and bureaucracy. Further, even if the Government really represented the interests of constituents, it is still the case that political initiative is itself the noble and integrating act of every man. In government, as in economic production, what is superficially efficient is not efficient in the long run.

5. Living in the midst of an alienated way of life, we must mutually analyze and purge our souls until we no longer regard as guilty or conspiratorial such illegal acts as spring from common human nature. (Needless to say, I am here referring to ethical discussions, not amateur psychoanalyses.) With regard to committing such "crimes", we must exercise prudence not of inhibition but such prudence as a sane man exercises in a madhouse. On the other hand, we must see that many acts commonly regarded as legal and even meritorious are treason against our natural society, *if they involve us in situations where we cease to have personal responsibility and concern for the consequences.*

6. We must progressively abstain from whatever is connected with the war

I am sensible that this program seems to demand very great initiative, courage, effort, and social invention; yet if once, looking about at our situation whatever it is, we *draw a line* (wherever we draw it!), can we not at once proceed? Those of us who have already been living in a more reasonable way do not find these minimal points too difficult; can those who have all their lives taken on the habits (if not the ideas) of the alienated society, expect not to make drastic changes? If we are to have peace, it is necessary to *wage* the peace. Otherwise, when their war comes, we also must hold ourselves responsible for it.

4. The War

The emergency that faces sociolatry and state-socialism is the War, and we know that this catastrophe of theirs must overwhelm us all. Is it a necessity of their system? Must one not assume, and can one not observe, that beneath the acceptance and mechanical, unspontaneous pleasure in the current social satisfactions there is a deep hatred for these satisfactions that makes men willing to rush off to armies and to toy with the idea of loosing explosive bombs?

(To put this another way. In a famous passage Freud pathetically justifies competitive capitalism as a means of releasing aggression without physical destruction. Now if, under improved economic arrangements of full-employment and non-competitive profits, this means of release is thwarted, how will the general aggression find an outlet —if the aggression itself is not moderated by small-scale fraternal competition, mutual aid, and instinctual gratification?)

We have defined a mass alienated from deep natural concerns, but occupying the conscious and pre-conscious with every manner of excitement, news, popular culture, sport, emulation, expenditure, and mechanical manipula-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tion. Now let us draw from the individual psychology what seems to be an analogy, but it is more than an analogy.

When an ego-system is set up against the id-drives, rather than as the interpreter, guide, purveyor, and agent of those drives, then this ego is basically weak and "tends to destroy itself". Further, the more elaborate the distractions sought by the ego, the tighter is the defense and rationalization against the instincts, the greater the tension, the more suggestive and hypnotic the daily experiences, and the more inevitable the self-destruction. During the last years of his life, largely in order to explain the phenomena of war, Freud introduced into his theory the primordial death wish. But whether or not, as is hotly debated among the analysts, such a drive is really primitive (in general a hunch of Freud is better than the clinical evidence of a lesser man)—nevertheless, to explain the tendency to self-destruction that we are here considering, no such primitive drive is required. On the contrary, the rebellion of the instincts against the superficial distractions of the ego is a healthy reaction: it is a healthy kind of violence calculated not to destroy the organism but to liberate it from inanity. To the ego, however, this desire to "burst" (Wm. Reich) might be interpreted as the desire for suicide—and if the ego can indeed control the movements of the body and the imagination, that is in fact the end of the organism.

Let us return to the real social context (for all individual psychology is an abstraction): we see on all sides an ill-concealed—concealed only to those who are expressing it—hatred for the social satisfactions. The most refined champions of our civilized arena, namely the technicians and practical scientists, seem almost the most inspired to feverish cooperative activity if once it has in it the promise of violence. Further, the people as a whole can the more cheerfully rush to the destruction of what they have and what they are, because, inspired to it en masse and suggesting it to one another, they release one another from the guilty restraint that each would feel by himself.

The behavior of the Americans during the last interbellum was terribly significant. On the one hand, people were almost unanimously opposed to the coming war; there was even a certain amount of successful pacifist agitation (such as the barring of military training from many colleges). On the other hand, one economic and political action after another was committed that led directly to a world-wide war; and these acts were acquiesced in by the people despite the clear, demonstrative, and thousand times reiterated warnings from many quarters that the acts were heading towards a general war. It is absurd to claim that such warnings did not get a hearing, for the point is: why did they not? To me it seems that the public behavior was exactly that of a person in the face of danger that he consciously wants to flee, but he is paralyzed because unconsciously he wants to embrace it: thus he waits and will not think of it.

But alas! this social violence that wants, not to destroy mankind, but only to get back to natural institutions, cannot be healthy, because it will in fact destroy us.

We others had better wage our peace and bring them quickly into our camp.

Periodicals

"Racial and Religious Prejudice in Everyday Living." ***The Journal of Social Issues.*** **Vol. I, No. 1, Feb. 1945.**

This journal deserves mention only because it is part of a significant trend that has carried the social sciences from aloofness to application and from application to popularization. Sociology became an applied science long ago with that sorry creature the social worker, and the professorial consideration of delinquency, criminology, divorce, the mob, etcetera. In fact sociology was practically conceived in sin, from the wedlock of campus and incestuous culture. Anthropology, stronghold of the esoteric and inutile, was happily financed by the great endowments in pursuit of broken pots, cephalic indices and antique customs. Only now is it developing practical notions with a newly sprouted *Journal of Applied Anthropology* and the stirrings of Drs. Warner, Linton, Dollard, Chapple, Benedict, et al.

The Society for the Psychological Study of Social Issues represents the liberal academic psychologists who have turned their attention to "social problems." *The Journal of Social Issues* will henceforth be the regular quarterly publication of the SPSSI. The present number edited by Dr. Gene Weltfish, deals with economic and social discrimination against Negroes, Jews, Catholics. Future issues will discuss psychological aspects of re-education, social change, and bureaucracy in large enterprises. Each will be a symposium by prominent authorities and laymen. This one carries contributions by Drs. Daniel Katz, Kurt Lewin, Goodwin Watson and Gardner Murphy, and an assorted collection of "practitioners."

The style is uniformly simple, typed for high-schools and organized around "episodes"—short fictional statements of typical discriminatory situations à la Lloyd Warner. Practical suggestions by the authorities follow each episode. It is SPSSI's bid for the teen-age trade. Only the format betrays an academic origin.

Extensive analysis of the contents is unwarranted. The professors are outstandingly competent in social psychology—that is, each knows pretty well how people tick and how they can be tinkered with. But competence does not preclude banality, nor the fallacies which stem from unstated orientation. SPSSI's first yearbook, *Industrial Conflict,* was more honest in this regard, openly declaring its allegiance to the values of labor. Striking out for a wider audience, these values are subsumed here and, we may infer, diffused over the broader virtues of the middle-class community. Psychologists, too, have retreated with the CIO.

What remains to be declared is that these authorities are conditioned by the same forces they analyze. Economically secure if morally perturbed, their judgments predicate a system whose aberrations they would curb. So the substance of their wisdom is a measure of reform to which their bourgeois compeers were committed half a century ago, when the academician's conscience was yet undeveloped.

This can be seen from the nature of the "practitioners" whose comments supplement the professors. They represent the FEPC, the Jewish Theological Seminary, Freedom House, and the YMCA. Their milk and water diet has nourished the activities of uplift societies, inter-faith movements, and sewing circles for decades: freedom for

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

minorities lies through the channels of government and the righteous in high places, and in the process of education. "Arthur Brown should have reported his complaint to the FEPC office nearest his home." "Joseph Daniels should take up the problem with school authorities." "Frank Murphy could go to the Bishop and try to get him to act." (Messrs. Lawson, Tobias, and Agar.) A daring program!

When is SPSSI going to publish comic books?

HAROLD ORLANSKY

The Intelligence Office

The Germans are Clean and Neat

Sir:

In the October POLITICS there appeared an article written by an American sergeant in Germany entitled "500 Red Army Men." The author compares two groups of prisoners: the Russians and the Germans, and comes to the conclusion that the Germans are of much more value to the world than the Russians. The Russians do not represent anything. They do not have a personal culture nor do they know the culture of their own country. The Germans, however, not only know how to behave, but are clean and enterprising and the American sergeant discovers in them many human instincts. They play the organ, read books, organize a theater, etc.

This writer had to do with Russians and Germans before and during the war and can therefore visualize the Russian and German prisoners with whom the sergeant came in contact. He would like to say a few words on the subject.

This writer is a European and understands clearly that you can't build a better world on hatred of the German. The starvation of German workers and the hunger of German children doesn't please him. But there are facts which have to be known and the American socialist whom the fate of the Germans affects so deeply should have before his eyes the picture of the whole of Europe and the historical reality as it exists in fact. To want to re-educate the Germans is one thing but to try to prove that the Germans are better than others is too much, even for the stomach of a good international socialist.

At first, let us have a look at the Russians. 500 Russian soldiers means 400 Russian peasants, 80 soldiers from small towns and 20 from Moscow or Leningrad. Those peasants were taken prisoner three or four years before. They were pushed all over Europe, they lived in concentration camps the story of which was only partly told. On their hands are tattooed the numbers of slaves. Hundreds of thousands of soldiers like them were starved to death, hundreds of thousands of others were murdered. Then all of a sudden an American liberator-intellectual comes and starts an intelligent conversation about Pushkin. The soldiers do not know Pushkin. Then came American cigarettes and food packages. The Russian peasants hid the bread for later; they are dizzy with the human goods with which they are confronted. The American sergeant sees them with the eyes of a westerner. He doesn't see the human tragedy of a peasant thousands of miles from his land in an entirely strange world. He sees clearly the Russian primitive and has for the Russian peasant as much sympathy as the editor of POLITICS has for the Russian Government.

I read about children from concentration camps who hid bread in the sand because they were afraid that someone would take it away. The Russian prisoners are like these children. The German children do not put bread into the earth, which certainly doesn't prove that they are more intelligent. I don't know how the American sergeant would have acted after three years in a German concentration camp, but I am sure he would have better understood the works of Dostoievski. By the way, how many American farmboys and cowboys know the poems of Walt Whitman? How many of them ever heard of Pushkin?

The Germans are good organizers. They are specialists in organizing a regimented life. With this same method they organized all of Europe. Because there wasn't any organized anti-Nazi movement in Germany, most of the Germans became a part of the Nazi organization. The victims of this German efficiency didn't have as enthusiastic an attitude toward it as our American sergeant. Therefore, in writing about German problems we want to remember those for whom German proficiency in organization meant death and for whom German chaos spelled life. We are tired of people who speak with satisfaction of German punctuality and German trains which arrive on time. We want reconstruction and we long for renaissance. We don't want persecutions and atomic bombs but neither do we want to blot out the basic problems involved and dim the fact that the German workers supported Hitler and on his order willingly robbed and looted the nations of Europe. If one has a cancer the state of his health will not improve because the doctor tells him that he has a cold. We want to remove the cancer which was eating away the German working class. We don't want to talk them into believing that it was merely the grippe.

And then the fugues of Bach. When Josef Kramer, of Belsen, was asked what his hobby was, he answered, "I grow roses." A great criminal can cry when he hasn't milk for his pussy but this does not by any means prove that he has a great heart. There are ten million of us, men, women and children who have been killed by the Germans. 25% of the population of Poland disappeared. There are in Poland today 400,000 full orphans and 600,000 children who have lost one parent. The Czechs, the Yugoslavs and the Greeks will tell you the rest of the story.

We want to see the rehabilitation of Germany. With great regret we realize the degree of German degeneration. We want a happy Europe—all of Europe—but we want the independent American Socialists to have a picture of the Germans as they really are. We don't want them to create a picture of Germany to fit their personal political beliefs.

The American sergeant is happy that the Germans know how to repair a bathtub, that they are the best European nation when it comes to a knowledge of plumbing. German technical ability does not impress us at all. It took only ten years for the Germans to forget everything about the 100 year history of Socialism. After 100 years we will not have forgotten one year of the German rule.

There is one more aspect of this problem. All over Europe during the war there existed strong underground movements—all except in Germany. During the terrible years of the war, we didn't hear even one voice of protest in Germany. After the defeat of Germany there still was no anti-Nazi demonstration. The Italian workers killed Mussolini; they shot every Fascist they could lay hands on, until stopped by the Allies. In France, 40 years ago, millions of Frenchmen stood up in defense of the dignity of one man—Dreyfus. Stalin had to exterminate the leaders of a whole generation to fasten his rule on the Russians.

Has one Nazi died at the hands of the Germans since V-E

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Day? We do not know as yet if the German workers know as much as the Italian proletarians. We still have to see a German worker shoot a German Fascist.

Europe, during the war, was one big concentration camp and unfortunately every German soldier was a guard in that camp. The re-education of Germany must take a long period of time. We can't start with forgetting everything and understanding nothing. We have to understand everything and we should forget nothing. If, however, there exists historical progress, we have to believe that the German people and especially German workers will ultimately come to understand what we know today, and with the same disdain as we, look at the times of Adolf Hitler.

NEW YORK CITY — BALTICUS

NO HELP WANTED

Sir:

The clucking concern for me shown by the editors of *The New Republic* is touching. "In cases where a member of the Army did not submit a contribution to his superior officer," they write (see "Liberals and the Military (1)" in the November *POLITICS*), "it was our custom to clear it with the War Department in order to protect the writer." They knew I didn't give a damn about official Army opinion. I cited to them other articles and letters on the same situation written by other soldiers out there, both white and Negro, which were published by the *Northport Observer*, *The New York Post* and even *PM* without prior approval. The brass hats think twice before punishing a Negro soldier for exposing the lie at the base of the vicious Jim crow setup in the Army.

Can it be that the Editors' solicitude has its real basis in concern with 'military security' after V-J day? Certainly the Army considers friendly cooperation between white and Negro soldiers in an unsegregated detachment to be evidence of 'bad racial relationships.' Somervell suppressed the report of his board of officers who came to the same conclusions I did after studying mixed units on the Western front. The Army, as the organ of the ruling groups, has a stake in maintaining a rigid, low-caste status for Negroes. Security for it means opposition to change. But liberals in the past at least have prated about the extension of democracy.

POLITICS, I am afraid, is forcing some liberals to stand up and be counted. It's amazing, sometimes, what sides they choose!

CONRAD LYNN.

NEW YORK CITY

A Letter the "Times" Would Not Print

Sir:

Your readers might be interested in the enclosed letter, which the *N. Y. Times* regretted its "inability to make use of."

GLADWYNE, PA. — GERRIT TOENNIES

Editor, *The N. Y. Times,*

Sir:

Germany has been eliminated as a military threat by the provisions of the Potsdam declaration and the United Nations Charter. The Nazi spirit has been demolished by the removal of the state-imposed intellectual terror, which was one of its strongest foundations. Retribution and suffering, in the form of destruction, deportations, rape and starvation, have been inflicted upon the German people on a large scale, even if they should not attain the full eye-for-an-eye measure of the misery caused by Germans to their neighbors and those of their fellow-citizens whom their infamous leaders degraded for reasons of race or conviction.

Why is it necessary, now that these objectives have been accomplished, to continue the complete isolation of Germany's population from the outer world? Throughout the war the International Red Cross made possible the exchange of brief messages among personal relatives living in hostile countries. However, this admirable and humane service has been discontinued, as have all postal communications between Germany and neutral countries.

Are there reasons of a military, technical or political nature that necessitate the denial of the privilege of correspondence—allowed prisoners of war and even criminals detained in our penitentiaries—to a whole nation (regardless of whether they were active or passive supporters, cowed or courageous opponents of the dictatorship, or even its victims) and to the hundreds of thousand American citizens who are anxious to communicate with close relatives in the defeated enemy country?

On what grounds are American citizens, whose war time loyalty to their adopted country has been unquestioned and who as taxpayers willingly contribute to UNRRA and other public relief agencies for allied countries and Italy, being kept deprived of the right to send gifts of food and clothing to aged parents and other kin?

It seems to the writer of this letter that citizens interested in these human and thoroughly unpolitical questions should write to their Secretaries of State and of War requesting prompt release of private communications with occupied Germany and Austria, or disclosure of the reasons for the maintenance of a barrier not even imposed upon incarcerated convicts.

OCTOBER 16, 1945 — GERRIT TOENNIES

PATTON AGAIN

Sir:

I want to thank "Politics" for reprinting Patton's speech. His fascistic approach aroused many of us who read it. Naturally your omissions—particularly the expletives—were easily filled in by us. Your magazine did a public service in publishing his remarks. . . .

Of course in a periodical such as yours, the reader cannot be always in complete agreement. Being in the Army (though not, I trust, influenced too much by it) I am somewhat unsympathetic to CO's. And I cannot altogether feel charitably inclined toward the Japs, at least not after seventy to eighty air-raids. But I respect you for expressing unpopular attitudes and for upholding the rights of minorities. If there ever was a time for such championship, it is today. And I am perhaps one of the few men in the army who dislikes peacetime conscription. I think it is dangerous to democratic institutions.

PHILIPPINE ISLANDS — LIEUTENANT

CONTRIBUTORS

Arthur Wiser has begun serving his sentence in the Federal prison at Sandstone, Minn. His wife, Mary, and his two-months-old son are living in the Macedonia Cooperative Community at Clarksville, Ga. . . . **Gelo and Andrea** are socialists who live in France and took part in the Resistance . . . **Bruno Bettelheim** is director of the U. of Chicago's Orthogenic Institute, a school for "problem" children. His "Behavior in Extreme Situations", based on a year's confinement in Nazi concentration camps, appeared in our August, 1944, issue. . . . **Will Herberg** edited "Workers Age", published by the Lovestone socialist group; he is now research director of a large labor union in New York City.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Report on Food Packages

In our October issue we suggested that some of our readers might want to undertake to send regular packages of food and clothing to certain European families known to us and our friends. The editors of *The Commonweal,* of their own motion, most generously informed their readers of our appeal; and *The Progressive* was kind enough to print a letter from us on the subject. The response from the readers of those publications, and of course especially from the readers of POLITICS, has been extremely generous. As this goes to press, the figures are as follows:

347 people have either sent cash or undertaken to mail packages themselves.

193 European families are now receiving regular packages, many of them at the rate of one a week. 64 families are still to be provided for. We are getting more names constantly.

Cash contributions to date have been $1,241.50. Pledges have been made totalling $246.50 a month. This money is used entirely for food and postage; all the considerable correspondence and bookkeeping entailed is done on a voluntary basis by Nancy Macdonald and a half dozen friends of the magazine.

New offers are coming in at the rate of about ten a day, so by the time this appears the above totals will be considerably larger. Student groups have been organized at Cornell, Black Mountain and the Texas State College for Women to mail out packages; also at certain C.O. camps. One reader is sending out the original appeal in place of Christmas cards. Another writes in to suggest that in place of Christmas gifts this year, people give each other packed and wrapped gift packages to be sent to friends abroad.

It should go without saying that we realize that one package a week—the maximum permitted at present—can be merely supplementary to the most elementary needs of the recipient, and can help him little in the matter of all the other things necessary to decent living and of which we over here have such abundance and our friends abroad such a shocking lack. But it is at least a token of fraternal feeling across national boundaries. The idea of corresponding with individuals abroad, furthermore, seems to appeal strongly to people. The human ties whose formation the arrangement makes possible may turn out to be at least as important as the material help provided.

The letters that accompany pledges or donations are heart-warming to those working on the project. A few quotations may give an idea:

"This IS a project! Everyone ought to be glad of an opportunity to make up, however feebly, for the sins of our government." (New York City)

"It is a personal relief to be able to do something about one of the endless tragedies of this war era. Thank you for giving your readers this opportunity." (Berkeley, California)

"Have you any families with small children on your list? It is a project I should think school classes might be interested in, each child bringing some small item of canned food each week. I am going to suggest it to Stephen's teacher at the public school here . . ." (Philadelphia, Pa.)

"My husband is in the Army and, at the moment, we're living on allotments and unemployment 'benefits,' so we'll only be able to send one package a month. As soon as our finances take a turn for the better, we'll do more." (New York City)

"I am soon going to leave the Army after more than six years' service, during which I have learned a few of the facts of political life the hard way. To me your appeal seems like a real opportunity. I expect to have plenty of trouble with money when I get out . . . but I know I can manage at least one package a month." (Ft. Snelling, Minn.)

"We have long hoped for a way to help our European friends without, at the same time, implementing U. S. foreign policy." (Washington, D. C.)

"I think your plan of feeding individual families is absolutely splendid. Yes, it is constructive! If it's possible we would appreciate the name of a *German* family." (Havre de Grace, Md.) *

"It is both gratifying and paradoxical to be sending this small sum. Gratifying to know that I can do a little something . . . paradoxical to be sending it from this place in which the worst scourge of modern times was born." (Soldier in Alamogordo, N. M.)

"Please send me the address of a family. We will send one package a month. I don't think I can promise to do more, as I feed a family of four on $15 a week . . . But as I unpacked the weekend shopping bag, it came to me that I couldn't do this all winter, knowing that we might help even in this small amount. (Chicago, Ill.)

"I want my contribution to go to a German family because I want this German family to know that there is at least one American who is ashamed of her country's cruel and callous treatment of a defeated people." (Lexington, Ky.)

There are two more matters on which something should be said.

(1) SOME PRACTICAL INFORMATION FOR THOSE NOW SENDING PACKAGES: Evidence is accumulating that warm clothes and above all, shoes are needed perhaps even more urgently than food. Please try to find out the sizes worn by "your" family and send off the things before the winter is over . . . A letter just come from France (where about 85% of our families now are) tells us that certain articles which were once scarce are so no longer, namely: absorbent cotton, aspirin and other common drugs, safety pins, tooth brushes, shoe laces. Bread is now unrationed, but there are no potatoes—hence rice is important. Fats are especially rare. Pork, fish, cheese all scarce. Powdered eggs and milk, jams and jellies, and sugar are all much needed. There is now a small coffee ration, but no tea, chocolate or cocoa. And—again—shoes and clothes are desperately needed. Mark all packages "Gift Package."

(2) WHY DID "POLITICS" SET UP ITS OWN SEPARATE PACKAGE PROJECT? There was an item in the "On the Lookout" column of the Socialist *Call* recently (I have mislaid the clip) which stated that "Dwight Macdonald knows a good idea when he sees one" and went on to suggest that I had stolen the idea of getting individuals to send food packages abroad from the *Call* and had not even had the decency to mention the *Call's* project in starting my own. I wish the author had asked me about it first; there is enough friction and unpleasantness on the left without adding to it gratuitously.

* A great many of the responses specifically indicate they would like to help Germans. Unhappily, our Government has not as yet restored mail service to Germany hence there is no way of sending packages to addresses there. But many of the families on our list are German refugees living in France. We are delighted, incidentally, that so many of our readers feel a special obligation to Germans.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The facts are as follows: (1) The *Call* came out with its first public appeal for food packages about three weeks before POLITICS did; (2) Nancy began getting personal friends to send packages to POLITICS's friends abroad last summer, and by the fall we had worked out the idea of a general appeal to the readers of POLITICS to do likewise; (3) since I don't read the *Call* as carefully as I might, I had not seen the first two appeals there, and only learned of the existence of the *Call*'s admirable project after we had called together a few friends to plan our own appeal; (4) when I learned about the *Call*'s campaign, I invited Phil Heller, its director, to attend our meeting, which he was unfortunately unable to do; (5) I offered to mention the *Call*'s campaign in our ad, but Heller felt it would be confusing to do so.

We decided to set up our own project independently of the *Call* for various reasons: (a) The readers of POLITICS and its friends overseas are presumably a somewhat homogeneous group—many of them personally known to Nancy and myself—with whom it would be simpler and more satisfactory to deal direct from the office, instead of mixing them with a larger group. (b) There would be no practical advantages in merging, since the problem is not to wrap and mail packages (we turn over the cash donations either to a commercial food-shipping agency or else to a friendly German grocer who sends the stuff almost at cost) but rather to keep in contact with individuals on both sides of the Atlantic; we have learned by now that a large proportion of these letters must answer individual questions and cannot be dealt with wholesale. Finally, although I am all for persons of various political tendencies working together as much as possible, my political sympathy with the Socialist Party (and, I daresay, the sympathies of most POLITICS readers) is not ardent enough to make me want to merge when no practical advantages—and plenty of possible confusion—would result.

I hope it is not necessary to say that POLITICS endorses the *Call*'s project most warmly and hopes that many other parties and groups will either join in one of the existing projects or set up their own.

D. M.

CLASSIFIED ADS

European socialist, graduate mechanical engineer, married, no children, wants an apartment, furnished or unfurnished, 1½, 2½, or 3½ rooms in Manhattan or Queens. *Phone: Victor Raysman, at AC. 2-0656*

The Workers Defense League (112 East 18th St., New York City) invites POLITICS readers to: (1) send Christmas gifts to labor and race-relations prisoners in U. S. prisons (contact its Prisoners Aid Bureau); (2) attend its benefit performance of Lillian Smith's "Strange Fruit" on Friday, Dec. 21; tickets from $1.80 to $4.20.

"Questions We Have in Common"

The remaining three discussion-meetings will be held at **the Broadway Central Hotel, at Broadway and Third St., New York City.** Time: 8:30. Admission: 25c. Dates:

Dec. 21—Frank Fisher: **Are Political Parties Obsolete?**

Dec. 28—Paul Goodman: **Decentralization.**

Jan. 4—Lionel Abel: **The Acceptance-in-Advance of World War III.**

This Is Berysch P.

Berysch is one of the people—friends rather—to whom POLITICS readers are sending weekly food packages. A friend of his writes us about him:

"Berysch was born in Poland and later went with his parents to Holland. In 1919 *he went to Russia and joined the Red Army. After the Civil War, he returned to Holland and became active in revolutionary politics. When the Dutch C. P. split, he sided with the left opposition. In* 1937, *the leaders of his union not only expelled him for political reasons, but also denounced him to the police, who ordered him to leave the country. He was forced to live illegally and had a very hard time.*

"When the Germans invaded Holland, he fled with his wife and child to France, where he was put into an internment camp. In the fall of 1941, *when life became almost unbearable in the camps, Berysch managed to get out and find work with a farmer. Friends tried to get him a visa to the United States, but by the time they succeeded, it was too late: Vichy was issuing no more exit visas.*

"The following year, he was caught by the Vichy police and deported to Germany with his wife. They were sent to the Auschwitz death-camp, and there his wife, who was pregnant, was at once sent to the gas chamber. Berysch himself, by some miracle, managed to escape and in the spring of 1945 *he arrived in France, sick and exhausted. He is now about* 50 *years old, lives with his daughter, and has no rich relatives.*

"We lived in Amsterdam with Berysch for six years—he was always a very fine and unselfish friend."

Politics, 45 Astor Place, New York 3, N. Y.

I want to help.

☐ Please send me the address of a European family, plus full mailing instructions. I will undertake to send them .....package(s) a month.

☐ I enclose $..... to pay for food packages. I will undertake to send you $..... a month to keep up the flow of packages this winter.

NAME .....

ADDRESS .....

CITY..... UNIT..... STATE.....

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED